





A HISTORY OF THE PRESIDENCY
FROM 1897 TO 1916

A HISTORY OF THE PRESIDENCY FROM 1897 TO 1916

BY

EDWARD STANWOOD, LITT.D. (BOWDOIN)



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge
1916

Copy 4

JK 511
.S7
1897-1916
copy 4

COPYRIGHT, 1912 AND 1916, BY EDWARD STANWOOD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published October 1912

SECOND EDITION PUBLISHED


September 1916

257,042
16

91-16
18-16
16-26861

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. "IMPERIALISM" THE "PARAMOUNT" ISSUE . . .	1
II. ROOSEVELT'S ELECTION FOR A "SECOND TERM". . .	77
III. THE ERA OF "PROGRESSIVE" INSURGENCY . . .	141
IV. THE REPUBLICAN SCHISM	214
V. THE EVOLUTION OF THE PRESIDENCY	305
APPENDIX	339
INDEX	373



A HISTORY OF THE PRESIDENCY FROM 1897 TO 1916

I

"IMPERIALISM" THE "PARAMOUNT" ISSUE

THE election of 1896 restored to the Republican party the full control of the national government in all its departments. The situation during the second half of President Cleveland's second administration was abnormal and unsatisfactory, for the government was divided against itself to an unprecedented degree. The Senate was still controlled by the Democrats and their Populist allies, by the narrowest of majorities, and the President was a Democrat; but the House of Representatives was Republican in the proportion of five of that party to two of the combined opposition.¹ Moreover, there was no real political accord between the Senate and the President. On the great issue of the times, the free and unlimited coinage of silver, they were actively antagonistic; and the closing chapter of the history of the Tariff Act of 1894 was still remembered by some leading Democratic senators, and the breach in their relations with Mr. Cleveland remained.

In such circumstances no legislation having a savor of party politics could be passed. The President was forced to rely upon Republican aid to deal with the fiscal situation — a serious deficit; and that aid was given, although the President and the Republican leaders disputed almost angrily the cause of the depletion of the gold reserve. Mr. Cleveland was no defender of the Tariff Act of 1894; but he contended that it was not true that the repeated gold loans were rendered necessary, and were made, and that their proceeds were used, to meet the deficiency in the revenue. The Republicans, on the other hand,

¹ Fifty-fourth Congress. Senate, Democrats, 39; Populists, 6; Republicans, 44; one vacancy. House of Representatives, Republicans, 252; Democrats, 93; Populists, 8; Silver, 1; Fusion, 1; vacancies, 2.

maintained that if the revenue had been sufficient the gold reserve could not have been drawn upon as it was, and that consequently the loans would not have been necessary.

The difficult situation was brought to an end when the new administration came into power. Congress was Republican in both branches,¹ and both the majority and the minority parties were more united than had been the case for a long time. The declaration in favor of free silver in the Democratic platform, and in favor of the single gold standard in that of the Republicans, in the canvass of 1896, caused a serious secession from each party, and the nominating conventions on both sides had therefore been careful to choose as candidates for seats in Congress men who could be relied upon to support the party policy on the great issue of the day.

Nevertheless the silver question was not the sole issue in the canvass of 1896, and the importance of the tariff issue must not be overlooked. In the far Western States, where the sentiment was almost unanimous in favor of free silver, the Republican campaign was conducted on the issue of Protection, as against the Wilson-Gorman tariff, and its free wool feature. It was not a successful campaign, so far as electoral votes were concerned, but it served to preserve a nucleus around which the temporary deserters clustered, at the next election.

On the other side of the political fence the situation was different. Many thousands of "Old line" Democrats voted for Mr. McKinley because of their opposition to free silver and the other radical policies championed by Mr. Bryan, and in spite of their only less serious objection to a protective tariff of which, in popular opinion, Mr. McKinley was the protagonist. Others, who could not forego that objection, voted for General Palmer. No Democrat of either of the classes opposed to Mr. Bryan was elected to Congress. But in the country, and in a certain portion of the press, the dissentient Democratic opinion made itself felt. It was urged, of course without avail, that the election had decided primarily that the people desired the establishment of the single gold standard of money, and only secondarily, if at all, that they were in favor of a protective tariff. Those who took that view maintained, accordingly, that

¹ Fifty-fifth Congress. Senate, Republicans, 46; Democrats, 34; Populists, 5; Independents, 3; Silver party, 2. House of Representatives, Republicans, 202; Democrats, 130; Populists, 21; Silver party, 3; Fusion, 1. Two of the Independents in the Senate usually acted with the Republicans.

the reformation of the currency system was the first duty of Congress and of the President, and they denounced the reversal of the programme as a virtual betrayal of the people whose mandate they had received.

Mr. McKinley made it evident in his inaugural address that he regarded a revision of the tariff as the immediate duty of the hour. Undoubtedly he personally deemed it of greater importance than the reform of the money system. But that is to be inferred rather from his speeches in Congress and as a candidate for the presidency than from his language at his inauguration. Indeed, his attitude toward the silver question was somewhat timid. He still spoke of keeping silver at parity with gold. But as for the tariff he was decided. "The people," he said, "have decided that such legislation should be had as will give ample protection and encouragement to the industries and development of our country. It is therefore earnestly hoped and expected that Congress will, at the earliest practicable moment, enact revenue legislation that shall be fair, reasonable, conservative, and just, and which, while supplying sufficient revenue for public purposes, will still be signally beneficial and helpful to every section and every enterprise of the people." He discussed the existing financial system, referred to the succession of annual deficits, assumed, without making an unnecessary argument upon the subject, that expenditures should be met by revenue rather than by loans, and set forth his opinion on the general question by remarking that "with adequate revenue secured, but not until then, we can enter upon changes in our fiscal laws."

Undoubtedly, in thus placing tariff revision first on his programme, he was in accord with the great majority of his supporters both in Congress and in the country at large. But there were two excellent reasons, from a practical point of view, why his preference was natural and wise. An attempt to establish the gold standard during the first half of Mr. McKinley's term would have been foredoomed to failure. The House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress was strongly anti-silver. If the question had been brought to a test it is doubtful if any Republican member of that body would have voted for free silver. But in the Senate it was different. As has been noted, there were 46 Republican senators, and 44 of the combined opposition, every member of which was a declared advocate of free silver. Four of the Re-

publicans were also determined advocates of the measure, beside two other senators who supported it conditionally. It would have been most unwise to submit a gold-standard bill to a Senate so constituted. Indeed, it soon appeared that the silver senators practically held the balance of power, and were resolved to make their own power felt.

The other reason for the preference of the tariff question over the currency question — if the reason just given had not been all-powerful — was the fact that the way had already been prepared for immediate action upon it. In anticipation of that which actually occurred, the Committee on Ways and Means of the Fifty-fourth Congress had for months been preparing a tariff bill. Protracted hearings were held, and a great amount of testimony was taken, no doubt with an understanding between the Committee and Mr. McKinley that an extraordinary session of Congress would be held almost immediately after the inauguration. On the 6th of March the President issued a proclamation summoning the Fifty-fifth Congress to meet on the 15th of the same month. At the beginning of the session he sent a message on the subject of the deficiency in the revenues of the government, and urged the speedy passage of a tariff act. All the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had been reëlected, and Mr. Speaker Reed¹ reappointed them on the committee. The bill was practically ready, and on the 19th it was reported to the House.

The modern practice of the House of Representatives in dealing with measures which are both complicated and of a partisan character, is to curb and limit actual debate by means of special rules. In this case the Committee on Rules brought in a resolution that the bill should be taken up for consideration on March 22; that "general debate" should continue for four days; that from March 26 the bill should be open to amendment in Committee of the Whole, — amendments proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means to have the preference; and that on March 31 at three o'clock the House should come to a final vote on the passage of the bill. A course of action precisely similar was laid out by the Committee on Rules of the Fifty-third Congress, when the Wilson tariff bill was brought in, in 1894, but the time allowed for proposing

¹ Reëlected Speaker by 199 votes, to 114 for Mr. Bailey of Texas, 21 for Mr. Bell of Colorado, and 1 for Mr. Newlands of Nevada.

and discussing amendments was longer. In neither case was the privilege of presenting amendments of the slightest benefit to the opposition, for the obvious reason that every such amendment, however meritorious, was certain to be rejected.

There is much to be said both for and against such a method of procedure. The traditional practice of parliamentary bodies is violated in a fundamental principle by a system which forbids a detailed examination of a revenue measure. The rights of the minority are practically abrogated, since they are conceded in such a restricted form that they are ineffective. The body which passes upon the measures before it under such rules has really ceased to be a deliberative body. The measures are drawn by a committee, or rather by the majority of a committee, and are virtually unamendable save by the consent of those members of the committee. Should any amendment not acceptable to them be agreed to in a snap division in committee of the whole, they are usually if not invariably able to reverse the decision when the bill is reported to the House.

On the other hand, experience has shown that the choice is not between this system and the former one, if a tariff bill is to be passed, but between the new system and failure to pass the bill. The House of Representatives is almost twice as numerous a body as it was when Clay brought in his compromise tariff bill, and there are probably more than five times as many talking members now as there were then. At the same time the volume of business to be transacted has certainly increased tenfold. If, then, a tariff bill were to be thrown open to detailed discussion, paragraph by paragraph, and article by article, it would not be possible to pass it even through the House of Representatives at a single session. It is also a pertinent suggestion that on such a subject as the tariff every member's mind is made up before consideration of the bill begins, that no member expects by his eloquence to influence the action of any fellow member, and therefore debate is wasted, so far as the theoretical purpose of debate is concerned. Moreover, a tariff measure is to be considered as a whole, not acceptable in every detail to any member, not to be rendered acceptable to any opponent of the protection or free trade principle on which it may be based, by one or a dozen amendments. Consequently every hostile amendment is sure to be rejected. Finally, as the only practical purpose of debate in the House of Representatives is to influence public opinion

outside, that purpose may be and is accomplished quite as well by the general "leave to print" undelivered speeches in the "Congressional Record," as by giving up time to their delivery. These arguments have been convincing to both the great parties in the country, and the practice of cutting off debate is so well established and has been so useful that it is not likely to be abandoned.

The programme prepared by the Committee on Rules was adopted by the House and strictly carried out. "General debate" was exceedingly general, being chiefly discussion of the vast benefits and the unrelieved wickedness of the protective system. More than half the time allowed for amendments was occupied in the consideration of changes proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means, and the opposition had no opportunity to discuss anything but the first schedule, devoted to chemicals, and a few paragraphs of the glass schedule. One important amendment, designed to levy the duties to be imposed by the bill on goods purchased and hurried into the country before the act should take effect, was adopted by the Committee of the Whole, but was thrown out by the House on the ground that, being retroactive, it was probably unconstitutional. An attempt was made to put on the free list articles the domestic production of which was controlled by "trusts," but the motion was defeated, yeas 148, nays 197. The bill was then passed, yeas 205, nays 122. Five Democrats voted for the bill; three Populists only voted against it. The others, 21 in number, answered "present."

The history of the bill in the Senate was remarkable. As it passed the House of Representatives it established duties appreciably lower than those imposed by the McKinley act of 1890. The Finance Committee of the Senate deemed even that scale of duties too high, and Mr. Aldrich, in explaining the action of the committee in proposing further reductions, urged that protection should be given in a moderate and conservative spirit, in order to "insure a much greater degree of permanence to our tariff legislation." But that policy was not to prevail. The "Silver Republicans" were among the most radical protectionists in the Senate, and they soon found that they held the balance of power. Indeed Mr. Jones of Nevada, one of them, could control the action of the Committee on Finance by giving his vote either with the six Republicans or with the six Democrats. In these circumstances the

Republicans both in the committee and in the Senate were forced to make concessions to the Silver men, with the result that the original policy of the committee was overthrown, the committee itself withdrew amendments reducing duties and offered others increasing them, and the Senate was compelled to agree in order to save the bill. Mr. Aldrich, whose health was greatly impaired by work and worry, retired from the management of the bill, — not unwillingly, in all probability, — withdrew to his home, and returned only on the day the measure was put on its passage. The vote was taken on July 7, and the bill was passed by yeas 38, nays 28. One Democrat voted for it, six Populist and Silver senators withheld their votes. In conference duties were raised in some cases higher than they had been placed by either the House or the Senate. The bill was signed by President McKinley on July 14. Thus was enacted the Dingley tariff, which was destined to remain in force for a longer period than any other tariff act in the history of the government. For save for the imposition of some duties as a measure of war finance, during the Spanish war — duties which were removed after peace was restored — the act was unchanged until it was superseded by the tariff of 1909.

Silver had been chosen by the Democrats as the "paramount" issue in 1896, but a question of vastly greater and more permanent importance was soon to be introduced. Events were already preparing for a contest which was to change for all time the position of the United States in the family of nations. Washington's injunction against the formation of "entangling alliances" with other nations had always been popularly and even officially interpreted as advice to hold aloof from international politics in any form. The Monroe Doctrine was not merely an assertion of a certain guardianship over the other American republics, to the extent of protecting them against European aggression, but it was also an expression of an intention to discharge that self-assumed duty alone, without asking or permitting assistance. The only instance where there was any departure from that attitude was in the case of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which postponed rather than promoted the building of an isthmian canal, and which many secretaries of state tried in vain to abrogate.

That the attitude of national isolation was in many respects beneficial to the United States, admits of no dispute. Interfering in no controversies in which it was not directly concerned,

it had no fear of interference or aggression by other nations, and was thus enabled to dispense with a great army and navy. In other ways that need not be specified it profited by its exemption from the duties and the tasks which other governments, from choice or from necessity, were performing.

But in another aspect of the matter the course of the government was not admirable. Students of history know that out of the original chaos of society, peace, order and law have been established. In enlightened communities every member has a duty to contribute his share to the maintenance of a system which assures protection of life and property to all, and which punishes malefactors and mischief-makers. Just so a community of nations has been gradually evolving, by no means perfect as yet, which more and more tends to concerted action for the preservation of peace, and to the curbing of reckless and aggressive sovereigns and peoples. If the citizen who refuses to bear his part in maintaining social order and in the support of good government is deemed unfaithful, what is to be said of a nation, boasting itself to be the freest in the world, which sends messages of encouragement to every band of insurgents in the world, on the plea that they are fighting for liberty, but which never lifts a finger to compose international quarrels, to help a weak neighbor attacked by an arrogant prince, or to punish violations of international justice? That was practically the position of the United States before it was awakened to the conviction that to be great and powerful and rich imposed upon it the duty to join with other nations in maintaining the peace of the world. The people had no idea that impending events were to plunge the country into world-politics and to enforce a changed relation of their government toward other powers. But both parties were equally responsible for the course of action which brought about that result.

The geographical position of the Island of Cuba, the western end of which penetrates the Gulf of Mexico only a few miles from the Florida coast, has made it always an object of interest, and frequently of apprehension or annoyance, to the government of the United States. There was a fear, during the administration of Mr. Monroe, that Great Britain had a design to acquire the island from Spain. Mr. Adams, then Secretary of State, wrote to Mr. Nelson, the minister to Madrid, that the transfer "would be an event unpropitious to the interests of this Union"; and that "it is scarcely possible to resist the

conviction that the annexation of Cuba to our Federal Republic will be indispensable to the continuance and integrity of the Union itself." Jefferson shared this view to the full extent, for about the same time he wrote to Monroe that "its possession by Great Britain would indeed be a great calamity to us," and that "her addition to our confederacy is exactly what is wanted to round out our power as a nation to the point of its utmost interest."

For many years, indeed until the crisis came in the last decade of the eighteenth century, the chief interest of the United States in Cuba may be likened to that of a landowner who is put to trouble and expense in preventing his unruly boys from helping the sons of a neighbor to turn him out of his property. To be sure, during the period when the slavery question was at its most acute stage, the "Ostend Manifesto" of 1854, — declaring the right of the United States to compel Spain to sell the island to this country, or, on a refusal to sell it, to wrest it from Spain by force, — was intended as a move preliminary to the acquisition of more slave territory. But in the main the government maintained a correct diplomatic attitude, and it did not fail to take measures to prevent aid being sent from its ports to the frequent and prolonged insurrections. Such measures were not always effectual, but the United States was the sufferer when that was the case. The incident of the *Virginius*, during the ten years' war from 1868 to 1878, was an instance in point.

A fresh insurrection broke out in 1895. It was different in method from any one which had preceded it, and more strongly supported by the Cubans, although the people of the United States were slow to perceive the differences. The insurgents overran almost the whole island, and audaciously approached even to the outskirts of Havana. They avoided engagements with large bodies of Spanish troops, but waged a successful guerilla warfare. They also set up the semblance of a government. From the very beginning Cuba was in a state little better than anarchy. Such a condition was intolerable to the United States. Aside from the horrors of the situation, — the destruction of life and property, — this country had a most material interest in the struggle. American citizens were seized and thrown into prison by the Spanish authorities, and the sugar plantations which were devastated and burned over by the insurgent bands were largely owned by Americans. Pres-

ident Cleveland, in his last annual message, in December, 1896, estimated the American investments in Cuba at from thirty to fifty millions.

This is not the place to give an account of the progress of the rebellion, nor to mention in detail the steps, marked by relentless cruelty, taken by Spain to put down the rebellion. There were in all about one hundred and fifty thousand Spanish troops in the island, but although they vastly outnumbered the insurrectionary forces, they were badly led and made but little headway.

The insurrection attracted but little attention in the United States at first. To a large number of the people it seemed only another rising, not essentially unlike, or more important than, the scores of revolutions which have been a feature of the history of all the republics of Latin America. It was to them a trial, an annoyance, like that which a peaceable householder experiences when a noisy and bloody quarrel is going on in the next house, — something to be endured with patience but without interference until peace should be restored. Many men held this opinion to the end, and rejected every suggestion that in the interest of humanity, and of a quiet neighborhood, the disturbance must be stopped. But the great body of the people, of every shade of political opinion, was swept off its feet in a burst of enthusiastic determination that the evil should be endured no longer.

The growing interest in the struggle and the change in the popular temper are reflected in the official papers of the presidents. In December, 1895, Mr. Cleveland recognized the sympathy of his countrymen with the insurgents, but urged that however ardent that feeling might be it should not deter the government from performing scrupulously its duty to a friendly power by preventing any hostile acts by its own citizens. The tone of his message in December, 1896, was not markedly different, but it contained some expressions which would have been inconsistent with the message of the preceding year. He discussed the situation in Cuba at great length, and in a spirit friendly to Spain, and examined, only to reject, the suggestion of forcible intervention. Nevertheless he added, at the conclusion "That it cannot be reasonably assumed that the hitherto expectant attitude of the United States will be indefinitely maintained," and that, "while we are anxious to accord all due respect to the sovereignty of Spain, we cannot view the

pending conflict in all its features, and properly apprehend our inevitably close relations to it and its possible results, without considering that by the course of events we may be drawn into such an unusual and unprecedented condition as will fix a limit to our patient waiting for Spain to end the contest either alone and in her own way or with our friendly coöperation."

The Cuban question occupied a large part of the time of the Fifty-fourth Congress,—the last of Mr. Cleveland's second term. There was a minority, not a large but an aggressive minority, which desired the immediate recognition of Cuban independence; there were many others who wished to accord belligerent rights to the insurgents. Including those two classes there was a large majority of members of both Houses who wished that something should be done to show the impatience of the American people at the situation. At the first session, after a protracted debate, a concurrent resolution was passed¹ after undergoing many changes, both in purport and in phraseology, declaring that a state of war existed in Cuba, that the United States would observe strict neutrality, and that the President should offer the good offices of the United States to secure the independence of Cuba. The form of a "concurrent resolution" was chosen because it did not require that the resolution should be submitted to the President for his approval as a "joint resolution" must have been. The President's attitude was well known. He took no action in accordance with the advice of Congress at the time. Later in the year he did take a step in that direction.² His unwillingness to do anything that would permit the Spanish government to suppose that the United States government was in sympathy with the movement for forcible intervention, was severely criticised, by members of his own party more than by Republicans; for those who were most determined upon a conservative course at this time were chiefly Republicans. The judgment of history will be that Mr. Cleveland's course was wise. It was something more than that, from a political point of view. It was eminently considerate, in

¹ Passed by the Senate, February 28, by yeas 64, nays 6; by the House of Representatives, March 2, by yeas 262, nays 17; conference report agreed to by the House, April 6, by yeas 247, nays 27; by the Senate without a division.

² "It was intimated by this government to the government of Spain some months ago that if a satisfactory measure of home rule were tendered to the Cuban insurgents and would be accepted by them upon a guaranty of its execution, the United States would endeavor to find a way not objectionable to Spain of furnishing such a guaranty." President's Message, December, 1896.

that it was precisely the course which was likely to be least embarrassing to his successor in office.

When the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress began, in December, 1896, numerous resolutions were introduced demanding that the independence of Cuba be immediately recognized. On the 19th of that month, Mr. Olney, the Secretary of State, caused it to be stated in the public press that the power and the right to recognize foreign governments was vested exclusively in the President. That contention was hotly disputed by the more radical advocates of Cuban independence. Early in January Senator Eugene Hale, of Maine, presented an exhaustive historical memorandum which sustained the administration in its position on that point. He also introduced, January 6, a resolution, which was passed, calling on the Secretary of State for a report on the precedents covering the matter of recognition of a foreign government.¹ On the following day Mr. Mills of Texas offered a resolution, which was subsequently debated but never acted upon, asserting that the expediency of such recognition belongs to Congress; that when Congress should determine in favor of recognition the executive should act in harmony with the legislative department; and "that the independence of Cuba ought to be and hereby is recognized." The resolution throws light upon the political situation in the closing months of Mr. Cleveland's administration. Hardly at any other time in the history of the country would a leading senator, in full and regular standing in his party, have urged a resolution making such a direct and aggressive attack upon a position held by the president chosen by that party. But, as is well known, the convention and the election of 1896 had left a breach between the President and the controlling wing of the Democratic party that was almost as wide as that between the Democrats and the Republicans.

Both the great parties of the country, meanwhile, had expressed themselves strongly in their national platforms on the subject of Cuba. The Democrats merely expressed their hearty sympathy with the Cubans in their struggle for independence. The Republicans went further, and concluded their resolution on the subject by urging that the government "should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island." It would not be true, nevertheless, to say that these expressions represented a unanimous wish of

¹ It does not appear that the inquiry was ever answered.

the people. There were still many men in public and private life who held that the contest was one in which it was permitted to all citizens to feel a deep sympathy with the insurgents and horror at the cruelties of the Spanish administration; but that as a government the United States had neither a duty nor a right to dictate to Spain how it should deal with a colony in revolt. But these men did not undertake to prevent the adoption of the resolutions of sympathy by the national conventions.

The attitude of Mr. McKinley on the Cuban question was not noticeably different from that of Mr. Cleveland. His instructions to Mr. Woodford, the new minister to Spain, were conservative and conciliatory. He was "to impress upon that government the sincere wish of the United States to lend its aid toward the ending of the war in Cuba by reaching a peaceful and lasting result, just and honorable alike to Spain and to the Cuban people," and was to represent "that at this juncture our government was constrained to seriously inquire if the time was not ripe when Spain, of her own volition, moved by her own interests and every sentiment of humanity, should put a stop to this destructive war, and make proposals of settlement honorable to herself and just to her Cuban colony."¹ General Woodford, acting upon these instructions, had the good fortune to deal with Señor Sagasta, the new Prime Minister of Spain, who succeeded Señor Canovas, who was assassinated in August, 1897. The new Spanish government was certainly better disposed toward Cuba and toward the United States than that which preceded it. The suggestions were received in an amicable spirit. The government did recall General Weyler, the governor-general of Cuba, whose administration had been extremely cruel, particularly in the policy of removing the entire population from their rural homes and concentrating them in the cities and in camps. It also decreed the establishment of a local home rule government, and released all the Americans who had been in confinement. But it did not relax or propose to relax any military measures against the insurgents in arms who, in turn, spurned any concessions short of complete independence. In effect, therefore, the situation was unchanged. The war continued. The Spanish government was unable, as it had been from the beginning, to pacify Cuba.

The crisis was approaching. Two events in the month of

¹ Message of December, 1897.

February, 1898, had a most profound effect upon the people of the United States. On the 9th a private letter by Señor De Lome, the Spanish minister at Washington, was made public, in which he characterized the President as "weak and yielding to the rabble," and as a "bad politician." He was at once recalled, and his sentiments were disavowed by the Spanish government; but the people were in a mood to be absolutely distrustful of the Spanish government. On the 10th, in consequence of this disclosure, Mr. Cannon of Illinois, since Speaker of the House of Representatives, introduced a resolution urging the sending of an ultimatum to Spain, and a recognition of the independence of Cuba before the 4th of March.

But that incident created a mere flurry of popular excitement in comparison with the startling event which took place on the evening of February 15. The battleship Maine arrived in the port of Havana on January 25. It was sent thither after consultation with the Spanish government, and with the full consent of that government, as a mark of friendliness and good will. On the night of February 15 it was blown up in Havana harbor, and sunk, and two officers and 264 of the crew perished, as a result of the catastrophe. A court of inquiry was instituted, which reported that the "effect could have been produced only by the explosion of a mine situated under the bottom of the ship."

On the whole the people of the United States received the intelligence of the dreadful disaster with horror rather than with indignation. They waited, without a general prejudgement against Spain as the author of the calamity, until the facts should be known. But it had already become clear that there was a dire prospect that forcible intervention, which meant war, must ensue before the questions at issue were decided; and Congress was prompt to take precautions against that event. On March 8 the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote, yeas 311, nays none, passed a bill containing an appropriation of fifty million dollars for national defence, to be at the disposal of the President, and the Senate passed the bill on the next day, without change or debate, and with equal unanimity. The President communicated the facts regarding the destruction of the Maine and the finding of the court, in a message to Congress on March 28. The affair made a deep impression upon the minds of the people and greatly intensified the feeling that intervention in Cuba could not,

and should not, be long delayed. That feeling was rather increased than allayed by the fact that the Spanish government made an inquiry of its own, the result of which was a finding that the explosion which caused the destruction of the battleship was from the inside, that there were no mines in Havana harbor, and that no responsibility for the disaster rested on Spain or Spaniards.

Meantime public sentiment hostile to Spain was still further augmented both in volume and in intensity, by a speech made in the Senate on March 17, by Senator Proctor of Vermont. Mr. Proctor had lately returned from Cuba where he had made extensive observations of conditions. In particular he had studied the results of the Spanish treatment of the peasantry. He gave a harrowing account of the desolation and distress caused by the cruel policy of concentration, and estimated the loss of life during the three years of anarchy at several hundred thousand. In a short time the demand for action on the part of the United States to put an end to the disturbance by removing its cause, became overwhelming. In the popular view the only possible remedy was the absolute abandonment of Cuba by Spain.

The tension that existed between the two governments at this time is illustrated by another incident. Early in March the Spanish minister at Washington asked that the Consul-General at Havana, General Fitzhugh Lee, be recalled, and that merchant vessels should be substituted for the naval vessels that were carrying relief to the distressed people of Cuba. Both requests were denied, and were not pressed.

On March 23 General Woodford presented to the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs a formal statement to the effect that unless an agreement ensuring immediate and honorable peace in Cuba were reached within a short time, the President would be constrained to submit to the consideration of Congress the whole question of the relations between the United States and Spain, including the affair of the Maine. The Spanish Minister replied on the 25th, asking that the report on the Maine should not be sent to Congress, and that the question of the future of Cuba should be left to diplomacy. General Woodford asked if Spain would grant an armistice, meantime. The answer of Spain to these latest propositions was received on April 1. It was thoroughly unsatisfactory. Although pacific in tone it contained nothing more than promises to con-

sider the questions at issue at a future time. Spain would not object to an armistice if it were asked for by the insurgents — an impossible condition as was well known by both parties to the controversy. As for the question of the future relations between Spain and Cuba, that was to be committed to the consideration of the courts, which would not assemble until May.

From the time when this reply of Spain was made public, war was inevitable, although the fact was not fully perceived or universally admitted. The President did not abandon hope. The pressure upon him to act instantly and vigorously, was tremendous. It came from both sides of the Senate and House, and from most of the newspapers of the country. But he appealed to those who were demanding importunately that he should act at once, to permit him to work out the matter in his own way without interference. To a certain extent they complied with his request, for a time. In his desire to avoid war he was stoutly supported by a group of senators,¹ all of them, it is believed, members of the Republican party.

The imminence of war had by this time attracted the notice of the European governments. The Pope made a proposition to some of the powers that they should unite in a movement for mediation between the United States and Spain. The attempt failed. It is not known precisely what attitude was taken by the several powers, but it is known that Great Britain refused to be a party to the movement, a refusal which alone was fatal to it; and the United States was averse to it, which, also, if the powers had come to an agreement, would have insured its failure. But on the 7th of April a deputation of the diplomatic representatives of foreign governments in Washington, called upon the President, and through Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British minister, expressed their hope that a peaceful solution of the difficulty would be reached. The President made a judicious and non-committal but pacific reply, and that was the end of foreign mediation.

The situation was now that which the President had informed the Spanish government would constrain him to submit to Congress the whole question of the relations between the two countries. But he still hesitated, and delayed carrying out his announced purpose. Fearing that in the excited state

¹ Among them were Senators Allison, Aldrich, Fairbanks, Hale, Hanna, Platt of Connecticut, and Spooner.

of public feeling insults and possibly physical injury would be suffered by his countrymen in Cuba, the President recalled Consul-General Lee, on April 5, and directed him to bring to the United States with him all American citizens who desired to return. Even after they had left Havana he withheld his message. The chances of peace and war seemed to vary from day to day. The Spanish ministry, urged thereto by the foreign ambassadors in Madrid, decided on April 9 to grant an armistice to the Cuban insurgents, but took no step toward an agreement with the United States on the subject of the future control of Cuba, which was regarded at Washington as an indispensable part of a settlement. The government also caused it to be published that it had reached the limit of concessions to the United States. It therefore only remained for the President to submit the whole matter to Congress. This he did in a message to the two Houses on April 11.

Having given a summary account of the negotiations, he remarked, referring to the answer given to General Woodford to his ultimatum, "with this last overture in the direction of immediate peace, and its disappointing reception by Spain, the Executive is brought to the end of his effort." He assigned four reasons why intervention to restore peace was justifiable: intervention was demanded in the interest of humanity, and it was "no answer to say this is all in another country, belonging to another nation, and is therefore none of our business," for "it is right at our door"; it was required for the protection of American citizens and property in Cuba; it was justified by the injury to American commerce and business; and "the present condition of affairs in Cuba is a constant menace to our peace, and entails upon this government an enormous expense." The most pregnant passage in the message is the following paragraphs:—

The long trial has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war, cannot be attained. The fire of insurrection may flame or may smoulder with varying seasons, but it has not been and it is plain that it cannot be extinguished by present methods. The only hope of relief and repose from a condition which can be no longer endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which give us the right and the duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop.

In view of these facts and of these considerations I ask the Con-

gress to authorize and empower the President to take measures to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes.

On the 13th of April the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, each reported a preamble and resolutions on the subject of Cuba. The debate proceeded simultaneously in both branches. The House resolution — the preamble and that of the Senate were similar in tone — was as follows : —

That the President is hereby authorized and directed to intervene at once to stop the war in Cuba, to the end and with the purpose of securing permanent peace and order there and establishing by the free action of the people thereof a stable and independent government of their own in the island of Cuba. And the President is hereby authorized and empowered to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute the purpose of this resolution.

The Democratic members of the committee, representing the universal sentiment within their party that there should be no intervention without recognizing the insurgent government of Cuba, proposed a substitute for the foregoing resolution, namely : —

Section 1. That the United States government hereby recognizes the independence of the republic of Cuba.

Section 2. That, moved thereto by many considerations of humanity, of interest, and of provocation, among which are the deliberate mooring of our battle-ship the 'Maine' over a submarine mine, and its destruction in the harbor of Havana, the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to employ immediately the land and naval forces of the United States in aiding the republic of Cuba to maintain the independence hereby recognized.

Section 3. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to extend immediate relief to the starving people of Cuba.

When the question was brought to a vote in the House substitution of the Democratic resolution was refused by yeas 150, nays 190. Only thirteen members were absent when the vote was taken. Every Democrat and Populist and four Republicans voted for substitution. The negative vote was of course exclu-

sively Republican. The majority resolution was adopted, yeas 322, nays 19. The negative votes were given by sixteen Democrats, who probably so voted to express their dissatisfaction with the terms of the resolution, and three Republicans who were opposed altogether to intervention.

The Senate Committee presented its own resolution, which in effect was more like that of the Democratic substitute in the House than like the resolution which the House passed. The Senate was more — and differently — divided in sentiment than was the House. The opposition to immediate intervention was much stronger, and on the other hand there was more support on the Republican side to the policy of recognizing the insurgent government of Cuba than was the case in the House of Representatives. The resolution as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was in the following terms: —

First, That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be free and independent.

Second, That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the government of the United States does hereby demand, that the government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States, the militia of the several states, to such an extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

A minority of the committee, three Democrats and one Republican, while cordially approving the resolution, as far as it went, were in favor of a recognition of the nominal government of Cuba, and proposed to amend the first paragraph of the resolution as printed above, by adding —

and that the government of the United States hereby recognizes the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of the island.

After a long debate the amendment was carried by a vote of yeas 51 (41 Democrats and Free Silver men, 10 Republicans), nays 37 (33 Republicans, 4 Democrats). Without opposition or a division the Senate added the famous Teller clause, as follows: —

Fourth, that the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over

said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Thus amended, the resolution was substituted for that of the House of Representatives, and was passed by a vote of yeas 67, nays 21. Forty-three Democrats and Populists, and twenty-four Republicans constituted the majority; nineteen Republicans and two Democrats the minority. The opposition in the House to recognition of the republic of Cuba was sufficiently strong to secure a rejection of that clause of the first paragraph. The Committee of Conference recommended that the clause be omitted. Although that course was highly unsatisfactory to the advocates of recognition the conference report was agreed to by the House by yeas 311, nays 6. But in the Senate only three Democrats voted aye, and the result was yeas 42, nays 35—all Democrats and Populists. The resolution finally adopted was in the form originally proposed by a majority of the Senate committee, with the addition of the Teller amendment. The President approved it on April 20.

The resolution meant war. Probably no senator or member of the House doubted that when he voted, whether for or against it. Nor was there any doubt on that point on the part of the Spanish government. It had already declared, in response to a joint note by the ambassadors of France, Germany, Italy, and Russia, that it had reached the limit of concession to the demands and pretensions of the United States. Only eleven minutes after the President signed the joint resolution Señor Polo y Bernabe, the Spanish minister, demanded his passports. The resolution was cabled to Madrid, to Minister Woodford, together with an ultimatum, allowing three days only for Spain to accede to the terms of the resolution, failing which he would proceed to act upon the authority it conferred upon him. The delivery of the note was purposely withheld in order to enable the Spanish government to act first if it should wish to do so. It did so wish, and accordingly sent General Woodford his passports. Thus diplomatic relations between the two governments were severed, and war began.

This is not the place to give, even in the barest outline, a history of the war. The events which led up to the war were strictly political events, but in no sense or degree partisan. They were of the utmost importance in changing the attitude of the United States toward other powers, and toward the world at

large. But in bringing them about both parties, or rather all parties, shared the responsibility. They took place under a Republican administration, but the Democratic and Populist senators and members were more eager for the conflict and more nearly unanimous in supporting warlike measures and threats than were the Republicans. Although on the final vote in the Senate they opposed the acceptance of the conference report which ensured the passage of the war resolution, they opposed it solely because it did not go so far as they desired.

In January, 1893, a revolution took place in the kingdom of Hawaii, and Queen Liliuokalani was forced to abdicate. It was alleged by the Democrats that the revolution was promoted, was even made possible, by the landing of United States marines, at the request of Mr. John L. Stevens, the American minister to the island kingdom. The accusation was denied by Mr. Stevens and was generally held by Republicans to be false, although the fact that the marines were landed in Honolulu was not disputed. It was also not disputed that the revolution was in the interest of annexation of the islands to the United States. The leaders were all, or nearly all, Americans by birth or descent. Soon after the provisional government was organized a treaty of annexation was concluded between the two governments, subject to the usual ratifications. It was promptly ratified by the Hawaiian government, but was warmly opposed by the Democrats of the United States, and by the members of that party in the Senate. One of the early acts of President Cleveland after taking office in 1893 was to withdraw the treaty from the Senate where it was pending. During the year or two following the withdrawal questions relating to Hawaii were hotly discussed by the two parties, the Democrats attacking the Republicans as being responsible for the dethronement of the queen, the Republicans retorting with accusations that the statements made by commissioners sent to Honolulu by Mr. Cleveland distorted the facts. Upon the accession of Mr. McKinley to the presidency another treaty of annexation was negotiated with the republican government that had been organized in 1894, and proclaimed on July 4 of that year, in succession to the provisional government. But that treaty encountered the opposition not only of Democratic senators,¹ but also of some influential Republicans. Although it was concluded and sent to the Senate on June 16, 1897, and was

¹ They were not all opposed to it.

unanimously ratified by both houses of the Hawaiian legislature on September 10, it had not been brought to a vote in the United States Senate when the war with Spain broke out. It was feared by the advocates of the treaty that it would not command the necessary two-thirds vote.

The naval battle in Manila Bay introduced a new and powerful argument in favor of the annexation of Hawaii. In all probability no senator or congressman had any idea in the early summer of 1898 that the United States would require a cession of the Philippine Islands by Spain, or that it would accept sovereignty over them. But the country was engaged in operations in the Pacific Ocean which made it imperative that it should be secure against hostile movements, and that advantage should not be taken of its entanglement with Spain to transfer the Hawaiian Islands to any other power. The importance of acting promptly was appreciated by the administration, and accordingly resort was had to the method which was adopted in the case of Texas. On May 17, 1898. Mr. Hitt of Illinois reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a joint resolution providing that, as the government of Hawaii had consented in due form to the cession to the United States of all rights of sovereignty over the islands,¹ the cession was "accepted, ratified and confirmed." The resolution covered much ground in the matter of the future government of the islands, and provided for commissioners to carry the resolution into effect. The policy of annexation was debated with great vigor on both sides. The opposition, consisting chiefly of Democrats, argued strongly against the constitutionality of an absorption of distant territory, as well as against the expediency of the measure. The advocates of the resolution dwelt upon the predominance of American interests in the islands, and the danger of their conquest by Japan in the event of a failure by the United States to accept the cession when it was offered. A vote upon the resolution was not taken until June 15, when a substitute proposed by the minority was rejected, yeas 96, nays 204. The substitute declared that the United States would "regard as an act of hostility any attempt upon the part of any government of Europe or Asia to take or hold possession of the Hawaiian Islands, or to exercise upon any pretext or under any conditions sovereign authority therein." It also announced a purpose to guarantee and maintain

¹ By its ratification of the treaty of annexation, September 10, 1897.

the independence of the people of the islands. The substitute having been rejected, the resolution was passed, yeas 209, nays 91. Thirty-one Democrats and Populists voted in the affirmative, and three Republicans in the negative. Otherwise it was a party vote. The resolution was taken up for discussion by the Senate on June 20, and the debate continued until July 6, when, many hostile amendments having been rejected, it was passed, yeas 42, nays 21. On this vote six Democrats and two Independents voted with the majority, and two Republicans with the minority. The President approved the joint resolution on June 7. The transfer took place and the flag of the United States was raised at Honolulu on the 12th of August. Thus, before the close of the Spanish war which was to carry the country much further in the same direction, the government entered upon the policy of so-called imperialism, — the sovereignty over and control of distant territory inhabited by an alien race.

Negotiations for the restoration of peace with Spain were opened on July 26 by M. Jules Cambon, the French minister at Washington, at the instance of the Spanish government. A protocol was signed by Mr. Day, Secretary of State, and M. Cambon on August 12. On the 26th the President appointed five commissioners to conclude a treaty of peace with an equal number of commissioners on the part of Spain. They met in Paris on October 1, but it was not until December 10 that the treaty was drawn up and signed. The Spanish commissioners found many of the demands inadmissible, and protested strongly against their harshness, but the President was unyielding, and in the end the Spanish government was forced to accept the terms imposed on it.

Nearly a full month was occupied in contention over the question of the future of the Philippine Islands, which had been left open in the protocol.¹ It became known during the discussion of the treaty that the instructions of the President to the commissioners had been that they were to demand the cession of the island of Luzon only. But it seemed to the commissioners that there were grave objections to that course, and upon their recommendation the President authorized them to

¹ The third article of the protocol was as follows: "That the United States will occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila, pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace which shall determine the control, disposition and government of the Philippines."

require the cession of the entire group of islands. The decision was a momentous one, for it introduced a fundamental change in the character of the government, and will affect its history in all future time.

Prior to the time when the demand for the cession of the whole archipelago was made there seems to have been practically no public opinion in the country favorable to the acquisition, and no expectation that it would be made a condition of peace. The President himself acceded to the representations of the commissioners with reluctance. The problem before him was most difficult. The acquisition of Luzon alone, it was easy to see, was not a solution. It would weaken Spain, and probably give over the other islands of the group to anarchy; and would not strengthen the United States materially. The only really available solutions were to take the whole of the islands or none. The decision to take the whole came as a surprise to the people, and found a large number of them either instantly hostile to the enterprise or quite unprepared to defend it. An examination of the political platforms adopted at the State conventions in 1898 shows that in only two States did the Republicans favor the acquisition of the Philippines.¹ Many of the conventions approved the annexation of Hawaii, but New York and Tennessee only favored that of the Philippines. The Massachusetts Republicans hoped that the negotiations would "be so conducted and terminated as to secure to the Philippine Islands and to Cuba in amplest measure the blessings of liberty and self-government."

The opponents of the Philippine policy were first in the field. Early in November, 1898, an Anti-Imperialist League was formed in Boston. Its principles were opposition to wars

¹ New York Republican convention: "We realize that when the necessities of war compelled our nation to destroy Spanish authority in the Antilles and in the Philippines we assumed solemn duties and responsibilities alike to the people of the islands we conquered and to the civilized world. We cannot turn these islands back to Spain. We cannot leave them, unarmed for defence and untried in statecraft, to the horrors of domestic strife or to partition among European Powers. We have assumed the responsibilities of victory, and wherever our flag has gone there the liberty, the humanity and the civilization which that flag embodies and represents must remain and abide forever."

Tennessee Republican convention: "We declare in favor of the annexation of Porto Rico and all the West Indian islands, and ultimate annexation of Cuba by the free suffrage of the people of the island, and such islands of the Philippines and other islands that may procure to the United States the trade and commerce of those islands and the good government of their people."

of conquest and to the acquisition of any colonial dependencies, and a rigid adherence to the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The venerable George S. Boutwell, formerly Secretary of the Treasury under General Grant, was the president of the League, which had members in many States of the Union. They included a certain number of Republicans, but were for the most part men who had participated in the mugwump movement of 1884 and subsequent years.

Undoubtedly a great majority of those who ultimately defended the Philippine annexation policy were convinced of its wisdom, even of its necessity, against their will. There were, it is true, a great many persons who welcomed it from a sentiment which is akin to patriotism, — from a feeling that the possession of distant territory, of colonies, increases the grandeur and importance of the nation, and that the lowering of the flag where once it had been raised even for an hour implies national humiliation. But the real strength of the policy was in something far different from chauvinism. A serious consideration of the actual condition of affairs in the Philippines led them to pause before "turning them back to Spain," — the phrase of the New York Republicans. Like Cuba, the islands had been in a chronic state of disorder and insurrection. To abandon them was to increase the evil. The hold upon them by Spain, weak at the best, would have been weakened by the defeat that country had sustained. The outlook was anarchy or a despotism, probably to be followed by conquest by Japan or some European power, which would exploit the islands for its own enrichment. On the other hand the United States was responsible for destroying the authority of Spain, and it thereby came under an obligation not to make worse the bad condition of the islands.

To all this those who took the anti-imperialist view had a ready answer. To assume sovereignty over an alien race by the purchase of their territory¹ was a distinct denial of the principles of the Declaration of Independence; it was a sufficient discharge of the national duty to treat the islands as Congress had agreed to treat Cuba, namely, to enable the people to form a government of their own; the "white man's burden" was a burden self-assumed, and the altruistic motives professed by those who advocated the acquisition, were a pretence. Moreover,

¹ By the treaty the United States was to pay twenty million dollars to Spain really, though not in terms, for the cession of the Philippines.

the success of the policy would involve the country in enormous expenditures; it would demand a great increase in military and naval forces; it would lead to "entangling alliances" with other powers, which the people, warned by Washington, had avoided for more than a century. These are but a few of the arguments they urged, — and if, in this summary, they seem to be phrased too broadly, the limits of space to put them as they did, *ipsissimis verbis*, may fairly be pleaded. In rejoinder those who supported the President and the commissioners made the point that the alternative policy of the anti-imperialists, the organization of a native government in the Philippines was grotesquely impracticable, as the natives were incapable of governing themselves.

The treaty was delivered to the President on the 24th of December, but as Congress was not then in session it was not sent to the Senate until January 4. Although the text of the agreement was not made public until a week later the terms were accurately known and the open opposition to it had begun. Mr. Bryan, who held the rank of colonel in the army during the war, took the position of favoring the ratification of the treaty, but at the same time arguing against expansion and imperialism. In an interview on December 13 he held that ratification was advisable on the ground that otherwise the two countries would still be nominally in a state of war, and that a renewal of negotiations would postpone unduly the declaration of peace. With respect to Porto Rico he would have the people freely decide whether or not they would be annexed to the United States. The Philippines were "too far away," and the country could not afford to accept them. Moreover, if the people of the United States were entitled to self-government, so were the Filipinos. This view was not approved by the Democrats in general, but the authority with which Mr. Bryan spoke undoubtedly had much influence with some of the Democratic senators, and ensured the ratification of the treaty. A debate sprang up in the Senate before the treaty was submitted to it. Several of the Democratic senators strongly opposed the policy of expansion beyond the sea, and argued that no constitutional power existed to authorize the acquisition of distant and detached territory.

After the treaty was received the subject was debated both in open Senate and in secret session for a full month. Under instruction by the President General Otis, commanding in the

Philippines, issued a proclamation to the people setting forth the benevolent intentions of the government and people of the United States toward them. The proclamation was hotly resented by the Filipinos who acknowledged the leadership of Aguinaldo. Aguinaldo had been a leader of insurgents in a former rebellion, and at the outbreak of the Spanish-American war was living at Hong-Kong. He returned to the Philippines under a certain arrangement with an American consul, to assist in the destruction of the Spanish control of the islands. He maintained that he was assured that the Americans would turn over the archipelago to the natives after conquest. Manifestly no person was authorized to give such an assurance, and the United States would not be bound by it if it were given. That fact, however, might well not be grasped by Aguinaldo, and the result of the misconception of the power of a consul was mischievous in the extreme. Aguinaldo and his followers would not be appeased. They insisted upon a course of action to which the United States could not consent. Such at least was the opinion of the President and his supporters. He and they had reluctantly taken the sovereignty of the Philippines, so they declared, not with any purpose of territorial and colonial aggrandizement, but solely because that seemed the only way to save the islands from anarchy,—not from a wish to govern them, but from a sense of duty. The opponents of the treaty derided and disbelieved the assertion, and maintained that the real motive was a desire for national expansion,—a manifestation of a mad passion for national glory, to be satisfied by a denial of all the fine principles on which the government had always before been conducted.

There were frequent conferences between the military authorities at Manila and Aguinaldo, but in the circumstances an agreement was impossible. In the evening of Saturday, February 4, 1899, a determined and concerted attack was made by the Filipinos upon the American forces. That was the beginning of a long, bloody and exasperating struggle, upon the course and incidents of which it is unnecessary to enter in this place. Undoubtedly it affected public opinion at home. The enterprise of reducing to subjection alien peoples, who seemed to be fighting for liberty and the right of self-government, was extremely obnoxious to a large number of citizens, perhaps to a large majority of them, including a great many who strongly supported the administration and its war policy. Those of that

class held that the natives of the islands were incapable of self-government, that Aguinaldo and his supporters were self-appointed leaders who at best represented but a small fraction of one race out of many in the Philippines, and that it would be a humiliation to the United States and a base shirking of duty to abandon the islands, in the face of hostilities, to insurgents who possessed so little authority.

But the outbreak of hostilities made it certain that the treaty would be ratified. The Senate came to a vote on Monday, the 6th, and the necessary two-thirds vote was obtained for ratification, — yeas 57, nays 27. Sixteen Democrats and Populists joined with forty-one Republicans in the affirmative. Two Republicans were with twenty-five Democrats and Populists in the negative. In spite of the cross-voting on this division the question of “imperialism,” as the policy of expansion was denominated by its opponents, was to be the “paramount” issue in the ensuing presidential election; yet on neither side of the division did any senator who had dissented from the action of a majority of his own party, separate from them in the canvass of 1900. Some of the Democratic senators were avowedly in favor of the expansion. Others endeavored to procure the passage of a resolution — offered by one of them — declaring the purpose of the United States to oversee the organization of a stable government in the Philippines by the natives, and to turn the islands over to that government, following the course it was proposed to pursue in the case of Cuba. Although the resolution was debated at some length it was never brought to a vote. A mild, non-committal resolution was passed after the treaty was ratified. Although the opponents of the Philippine policy made many efforts to secure an amendment, pledging the government to give the Filipinos independence, all such propositions were rejected, and the resolution as passed went no further than to promise such disposition of the islands as should be best for the natives and the interest of the United States.

The election of the Fifty-sixth Congress took place in November, 1898. It was entirely unaffected by any question of imperialism, since there was practically no opposition, certainly no partisan opposition, to the acquisition of Porto Rico, and the intention to demand a cession of the Philippines had hardly taken definite shape in the mind of the President, and was wholly unknown by the people. The issue in the election was

chiefly on the silver question. Although the Republican majority in the House of Representatives was reduced, the actual majority against the free coinage of silver was increased.¹ The House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth Congress would have passed an act establishing the gold standard, but there was a majority in favor of silver free coinage in the Senate, — a majority probably of eight or ten. But the election of senators by the State legislatures in the winter of 1898–99 changed the complexion of the Senate completely. No less than eight silver men were replaced by advocates of the gold standard, and there was no change in the opposite direction.

The President in his annual message to Congress, December 5, 1899, gave the first place to a consideration of the financial condition of the government, and the opportunity to make secure the gold standard of value. He wrote: —

While there is now no commercial fright which withdraws gold from the government, but, on the contrary, such widespread confidence that gold seeks the Treasury demanding paper money in exchange, yet the very situation points to the present as the most fitting time to make adequate provision to insure the continuance of the gold standard and of public confidence in the ability and purpose of the government to meet all its obligations in the money which the civilized world recognizes as the best. The financial transactions of the government are conducted on a gold basis. We receive gold when we sell United States bonds, and use gold for their payment.

The Republicans were resolved to use the opportunity to carry out one of the pledges in their national platform of 1896, which it was not possible to do in the preceding Congress. The very first bill introduced in either House was presented by Mr. Overstreet of Indiana, — "To define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes." It made "the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine" the standard of value. It was a long bill, and dealt with many other branches of the financial question, but the declaration that gold was the standard, and the pledge that all forms of money should be maintained at par with gold, were the chief points in the contest that followed.

¹ The House in the Fifty-fifth Congress consisted of 207 Republicans, 122 Democrats, 21 Populists, 3 Silverites, 3 Fusion, and there was one vacancy. In the Fifty-Sixth Congress there were 186 Republicans, 162 Democrats, 7 Populists, and 2 Silverites.

The bill was not referred to a committee, but on December 8, four days after it was introduced, the Committee on Rules brought in a special rule, which was adopted, allowing general debate on the bill from the 11th until the 15th, debate under the five minute rule on the 16th, and requiring the bill to be brought to a vote immediately after the reading of the journal on Monday the 18th. The programme was carried out strictly. The debate was conducted on party lines, and all the arguments on either side of the question were rehearsed and repeated by scores of members. At the close of the period assigned for consideration of the measure, all propositions of a hostile character having been defeated, the bill was passed, yeas 190, nays 150. Save that eleven Democrats¹ voted for the bill, the division was strictly on party lines. But a certain number of Democrats who were known to be opponents of 'free silver and advocates of the single gold standard, voted against the bill because it contained provisions to which they entertained objections. The bill was more fully considered in detail in the Senate. It was referred in that body to the Committee on Finance, which reported a substitute, containing provision for the refunding of the national debt. A prolonged debate came to an end on February 15, 1900, and the bill was passed, yeas 46, nays 29. Two Democrats voted in the affirmative and one Republican in the negative. It was not until March 13 that the conference report was adopted by both branches of Congress. The President approved the bill on the 14th.

In one respect the situation at the beginning of the presidential canvass of 1900 was without precedent since the adoption of the convention system. The candidate for President of each of the two great parties was designated in advance, without the semblance of opposition. After Jackson, who was elected for his second term without a formal nomination, only four presidents had been nominated for a second term. In the cases of Van Buren, Lincoln and Grant the choice of the opposing candidate was not predetermined; and the nominations of Cleveland and Harrison in 1888, although anticipated confidently, met with strong opposition. But in 1900, and even two years earlier, the selection of McKinley and Bryan to lead their respective parties again was seen to be inevitable. The

¹ Eight New York members, and one each from Maryland, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania.

President had not taken a course acceptable to all those who supported him in 1896, but the dissenters were comparatively few, and were not generally men whose influence would be perceptible in the choice of delegates to the national convention. The vast majority of the party regarded the administration as eminently successful and worthy of support, and Mr. McKinley was personally extremely popular. Some of his predecessors in office had been compelled to encounter the opposition of leaders of their own party by reason of their lack of the quality which enables men to be on terms of personal friendship with political friends and foes.

Mr. Bryan developed such a capacity for leadership in the canvass of 1896 that it was natural for him to continue in the position of leader after his defeat. Not only so, but it was natural for his followers in that canvass to accept his leadership. No other defeated candidate had ever assumed such authority. To no other had such authority been conceded. The Democrats, after the election of 1840, announced their intention of electing Van Buren in 1844, but they did not look to him for political advice, nor follow his advice on the few occasions when he gave it. Tilden and Blaine who were not elected, and Harrison and Cleveland who were defeated after a first term, were all more or less qualified to take upon themselves a measure of authority in guiding their party, but not one of them sought or exercised a tithe of the influence that Mr. Bryan held, with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the Democrats. During the whole period between the election of 1896 and the convention of 1900, his nomination was never for a moment in doubt.

There was far less assurance as to the result of the coming election. An issue completely new had been injected into national politics. On the Democratic side, under the leadership of Mr. Bryan, a determination was expressed, in case the party should obtain the power, to reverse the action of the administration with respect to the Philippines—to dispossess the United States of the sovereignty of the islands by setting up a native government. The war which the United States was waging to reduce those natives to subjection was denounced in unmeasured terms. The Republicans maintained that the country was under an obligation to civilization not to permit the Philippines to lapse into anarchy, which they were sure would be the result of the Democratic policy, and that the

restoration of authority and order by a suppression of the rebellion was an indispensable preliminary even to the establishment of self-government in the islands, were that to be the purpose of the United States.

The question of the time was how far the new issue would cause secession from the ranks of either party. Some of the strongest, most earnest and most energetic anti-imperialists were lifelong Republicans. The Spanish treaty had been strenuously opposed in Congress by such well known and influential men as Senators Hoar and Hale and Mr. Speaker Reed. Their views on the subject of taking and governing distant territory and alien races were shared by many of their fellow members of the party; but, as it ultimately became evident, the sentiment developed chiefly in New England and the Middle States. Moreover, not one of the leaders named proposed to leave his party and support Mr. Bryan. His continued outspoken advocacy of free silver coinage made him, for them, an impossible candidate. They hoped that in the end their own party would adopt their view and treat the Filipinos in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Independence. On the other hand a period of great prosperity throughout the country had rendered a large number of those who in 1896 had looked to the free coinage of silver as a cure of the prevailing hard times, quite indifferent to the application of that remedy. Consequently a return to allegiance to the Republican party by many men in the so-called Silver States, was confidently expected. Finally, there were many Democrats who upheld the policy of expansion, but they were not expected to vote for Mr. McKinley, — certainly not in large numbers. But the issue on which the canvass was avowedly to be made was so new that the result could not be predicted with confidence.

As has usually been the case the new parties — those which are based on dissent from the principles of both the leading parties, and those which deem most important other reforms than those which are in the minds of Democrats and Republicans — were earliest in the field. The first step in the canvass was taken at the fourth annual session of the Supreme Council of the Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, which was held at Washington on February 6 and the two following days. The Council pledged the support of the Alliance to the Candidates to be nominated by the Democrats, and adopted the following platform: —

Whereas, The Declaration of Independence, as a basis of a republican form of government that might be progressive and perpetual, holds "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,"

We hold, therefore, that to restore and preserve these rights under a republican form of government, private monopolies of public necessities for speculative purposes, whether of the means of production, distribution or exchange, should be prohibited, and whenever such public necessity or utility becomes a monopoly in private hands, the people of the municipality, State or Union, as the case may be, shall appropriate the same by right of eminent domain, paying a just value therefor, and operate them for and in the interest of the whole people.

We demand a National currency, safe, sound and flexible; issued by the general Government only, a full legal tender for all debts and receivable for all dues, and an equitable and efficient means of distribution of this currency, directly to the people, at the minimum of expense and without the intervention of banking corporations and in sufficient volume to transact the business of the country on a cash basis.

We demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the legal ratio of 16 to 1.

We demand a graduated income tax.

That our National legislation shall be so framed in the future as not to build up one industry at the expense of another.

We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all National and State revenues shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the Government economically and honestly administered.

We demand that postal savings banks be established by the Government for the safe deposit of the savings of the people, and to facilitate exchange.

We are unalterably opposed to the issue by the United States of interest-bearing bonds, and demand the payment of all coin obligations of the United States, as provided by existing laws, in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the Government and not at the option of the creditor.

The Government shall purchase or construct and operate a sufficient mileage of railroads to effectually control all rates of transportation on a just and equitable basis.

The telegraph and telephone, like the postoffice system, being a

necessity for the transmission of intelligence, should be owned and operated by the Government in the interest of the people.

We demand that no land shall be held by corporations for speculative purposes or by railroads in excess of their needs as carriers, and all lands now owned by aliens should be reclaimed by the Government and held for actual settlers only.

We demand the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; that each State shall be divided into two districts of nearly equal voting population, and that a Senator from each shall be elected by the people of the district.

Relying upon the good common sense of the American people, and believing that a majority of them, when uninfluenced by party prejudice, will vote right on all questions submitted to them on their merits; and further to effectually annihilate the pernicious lobby in legislation, we demand direct legislation by means of the initiative referendum. We demand free mail delivery in the rural districts. We demand that the inhabitants of all the territory coming to the United States as a result of the war with Spain be as speedily as possible permitted to organize a free government of their own, based upon the consent of the governed.

In January, 1900, a convention of the Social Democratic party was held at Rochester, New York, and a committee was appointed to attend the convention of the Social Democratic party to be held at Indianapolis on March 6, for the purpose of effecting a union of the two parties. The Indianapolis convention appointed a similar committee, and at a joint meeting of the two committees held in New York on March 26 a plan of union was agreed upon, to be submitted to the two parties. The plan was adopted on June 10, and at Chicago, on September 29, the ticket nominated at the Indianapolis convention in March, and the platform then adopted, were both ratified. By this action Eugene V. Debs, of Illinois, became the candidate of the amalgamated party for President, and Job Harriman, of California, was the candidate for Vice-President. The platform of the party, which retained the name "Social Democratic," was as follows: —

The Social Democratic party of the United States, in convention assembled, reaffirms its allegiance to the revolutionary principles of International Socialism and declares the supreme political issue in America to-day to be the contest between the working class and the capitalist class for the possession of the powers of government. The party affirms its steadfast purpose to use those powers, once achieved, to destroy wage slavery, abolish the institution of pri-

vate property in the means of production, and establish the cooperative Commonwealth.

In the United States, as in all other civilized countries, the natural order of economic development has separated society into two antagonistic classes — the capitalists, a comparatively small class, the possessors of all the modern means of production and distribution (land, mines, machinery and means of transportation and communication), and the large and ever increasing class of wage workers, possessing no means of production. This economic supremacy has secured to the dominant class the full control of the government, the pulpit, the schools, and the public press ; it has thus made the capitalist class the arbiter of the fate of the workers, whom it is reducing to a condition of dependence, economically exploited and oppressed, intellectually and physically crippled and degraded, and their political equality rendered a bitter mockery. The contest between these two classes grows ever sharper. Hand in hand with the growth of monopolies goes the annihilation of small industries and of the middle class depending upon them ; ever larger grows the multitude of destitute wage workers and of the unemployed, and ever fiercer the struggle between the class of the exploiter and the exploited, the capitalists and the wage workers.

The evil effects of capitalist production are intensified by the recurring industrial crises which render the existence of the greater part of the population still more precarious and uncertain. These facts amply prove that the modern means of production have outgrown the existing social order based on production for profit. Human energy and natural resources are wasted for individual gain. Ignorance is fostered that wage slavery may be perpetuated. Science and invention are perverted to the exploitation of men, women, and children. The lives and liberties of the working class are recklessly sacrificed for profit. Wars are fomented between nations ; indiscriminate slaughter is encouraged ; the destruction of whole races is sanctioned, in order that the capitalist class may extend its commercial dominion abroad and enhance its supremacy at home.

The introduction of a new and higher order of society is the historic mission of the working class. All other classes, despite their apparent or actual conflicts, are interested in upholding the system of private ownership in the means of production. The Democratic, Republican, and all other parties which do not stand for the complete overthrow of the capitalist system of production are alike the tools of the capitalist class. Their policies are injurious to the interest of the working class, which can be served only by the abolition of the profit system. The workers can most effectively act as a class in their struggle against the collective power of the

capitalist class only by constituting themselves into a political party, distinct and opposed to all parties formed by the propertied classes.

We, therefore, call upon the wage workers of the United States, without distinction of color, race, sex, or creed, and upon all citizens in sympathy with the historic mission of the working class, to organize under the banner of the Social Democratic party, as a party truly representing the interests of the toiling masses and uncompromisingly waging war upon the exploiting class, until the system of wage slavery shall be abolished and the coöperative Commonwealth shall be set up. Pending the accomplishment of this our ultimate purpose, we pledge every effort of the Social Democratic party for the immediate improvement of the condition of labor and for the securing of its progressive demands.

As steps in that direction, we make the following demands:

First — Revision of our Federal Constitution, in order to remove the obstacles to complete control of government by the people, irrespective of sex.

Second — The public ownership of all industries controlled by monopolies, trusts and combines.

Third — The public ownership of all railroads, telegraphs and telephones; all means of transportation; all waterworks, gas and electric plants, and other public utilities.

Fourth — The public ownership of all gold, silver, copper, lead, iron, coal and other mines, and all oil and gas wells.

Fifth — The reduction of the hours of labor in proportion to the increasing facilities of production.

Sixth — The inauguration of a system of public works and improvements for the employment of the unemployed, the public credit to be utilized for that purpose.

Seventh — Useful inventions to be free, the inventors to be remunerated by the public.

Eighth — Labor legislation to be National, instead of local, and international when possible.

Ninth — National insurance of working people against accidents, lack of employment, and want in old age.

Tenth — Equal civil and political rights for men and women, and the abolition of all laws discriminating against women.

Eleventh — The adoption of the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and the right of recall of representatives by the voters.

Twelfth — Abolition of war and the introduction of international arbitration.

As early as January, 1900, the national committee of the Union Reform party, an organization which had no visible ex-

istence at the preceding election, sent out ballots to members of the party asking them to express their preference for candidates for President and Vice-President. The ballots were returned in February and March, and in April the committee reported that the choice had fallen upon Seth H. Ellis, of Ohio, for President, and Samuel T. Nicholson, of Pennsylvania, for Vice-President. The number of votes given to them was not announced. The platform on which the party went to the polls had been previously adopted at a convention held at Cincinnati in March, 1899. As will be seen it had but a single plank, which was to be found in the platform of more than one of the other minor parties. It was as follows : —

Direct legislation under the system known as the initiative and referendum. Under the "initiative" the people can compel the submission to themselves of any desired law, when, if it receives a majority of the votes cast, it is thereby enacted. Under the "referendum" the people can compel the submission to themselves of any law which has been adopted by any legislative body, when, if such law fails to receive a majority of the votes cast, it will be thereby rejected.

Agreeably to a call issued at Chicago in December 1899, a convention of the United Christian party was held at Rockford, Illinois, on May 1, 1900. Delegates were present from Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Montana, and possibly from other States. As nearly as can be ascertained from the newspapers of the time they numbered thirty-one in all. Mr. W. H. Benkert, of Iowa, was the chairman. The convention nominated Rev. Silas C. Swallow, of Pennsylvania, for President, and John G. Woolley, of Illinois, for Vice-President. They both withdrew and Jonah F. R. Leonard, of Iowa, and David H. Martin, of Pennsylvania, were nominated for the two offices respectively. The platform adopted was as follows : —

We, the United Christian party, in national convention assembled, acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power and authority, the Lord Jesus Christ as the sovereign ruler of nations, and the Bible as the standard by which to decide moral issues in our political life, do make the following declaration : —

We believe the time to have arrived when the eternal principles of justice, mercy and love as exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ should be embodied in the Constitution of our Nation and applied in concrete form to every function of our Government.

We deprecate certain immoral laws which have grown out of the failure of our Nation to recognize these principles, notably such as require the desecration of the Christian Sabbath, authorize unscriptural marriage and divorce, license the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and permit the sale of cigarettes or tobacco in any form to minors. As an expression of consent or allegiance on the part of the governed, in harmony with the above statements, we declare for the adoption and use of the system of direct legislation known as the "initiative and referendum," together with "proportionate representation" and the "imperative mandate."

We hold that all men and women are created free and with equal rights, and declare for the establishment of such political, industrial and social conditions as shall guarantee to every person civic equality, the full fruits of his or her honest toil, and opportunity for the righteous enjoyment of the same; and we especially condemn mob violence and outrages against any individual or class of individuals in our country.

We declare against war and for the arbitration of all National and international disputes. We hold that the legalized liquor traffic is the crowning infamy of civilization, and we declare for the immediate abolition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. We are gratified to note the widespread agitation of the cigarette question, and declare ourselves in favor of the enactment of laws prohibiting the sale of cigarettes or tobacco in any form to minors.

We declare for the daily reading of the Bible in the public schools and institutions of learning under control of the State.

We declare for the Government ownership of public utilities.

We declare for the election of the President and Vice-President and United States Senators by the direct vote of the people.

We declare for such amendment of the United States Constitution as shall be necessary to give the principles herein set forth an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of our land.

We invite into the United Christian party every honest man and woman who believes in Christ and His golden rule and standard of righteousness.

The Populist party, which became divided into two factions in 1896, consisting of those who favored a complete fusion with the Democrats, so far as a support of the candidates of that party were concerned, and those who favored a "middle-of-the-road," that is, an independent policy, continued to be divided in 1900. The two wings of the party held conventions on the

same day, May 9, — the Fusionists at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and the "Middle-of-the-Road" faction at Cincinnati.

Mr. P. M. Kingdahl, of Minnesota, presided over the Sioux Falls convention. There was no opposition whatever to the nomination of Mr. Bryan as a candidate for President, but there was much dissension over the question of making a nomination for Vice-President. Those who regarded it as of great importance not to take action that would embarrass the Democrats, were opposed to the plan of making a nomination. On the other hand it was urged that by making a nomination the party would emphasize the fact of its separate and independent existence, and that the Democratic convention might, in order to secure the full support of the Populists, adopt the candidate selected by them. A motion to defer the nomination was defeated by 496 to 492 votes. Although the convention was attended by a large number of delegates, it should not be supposed that 988 persons were actually present. The delegates from any State, few or many, were allowed to cast all the votes to which that State would be entitled if the representation were full. As Mr. Bryan had already been nominated by acclamation the convention proceeded to the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President. Several gentlemen whose names had been presented having withdrawn, Mr. Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota, was nominated, also by acclamation. On August 8, after the Democratic national convention, Mr. Towne withdrew, and the support of the Fusionist Populists was given to the whole Democratic ticket. The following platform was adopted: —

Resolved, That we denounce the act of March 14, 1900, as the culmination of a long series of conspiracies to deprive the people of their constitutional rights over the money of the nation, and relegate to a gigantic money trust the control of the purse, and hence of the people. We denounce this act, first, for making all money obligations, domestic and foreign, payable in gold coin or its equivalent, thus enormously increasing the burdens of the debtors and enriching the creditors. Second, for refunding coin bonds not to mature for years into long-time gold bonds, so as to make their payment improbable and our debt perpetual. Third, for taking from the Treasury over \$50,000,000 in a time of war and presenting it as a premium to bond holders to accomplish the refunding of bonds not due. Fourth, for doubling the capital of bankers by returning them the face value of their bonds in current money notes, so that they may draw one interest from the government and an-

other from the people. Fifth, for allowing banks to expand and contract their circulation at pleasure, thus controlling prices of all products. Sixth, for authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue new gold bonds to an unlimited amount whenever he deems it necessary to replenish the gold hoard, thus enabling usurers to secure more bonds and more bank currency by drawing gold from the Treasury, thereby creating an endless chain for perpetually adding to a perpetual debt. Seventh, for striking down the greenback in order to force the people to borrow \$346,000,000 more from the banks at an annual cost of over \$20,000,000.

While barring out the money of the Constitution, this law opens the printing mints of the Treasury to the free coinage of bank paper money, to enrich the few and impoverish the many. We pledge anew the People's party never to cease the agitation until this great financial conspiracy is blotted from the statute books, the Lincoln greenback restored, the bonds all paid, and all corporation money forever retired.

We affirm the demand for the reopening of the mints of the United States for the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, the immediate increase in the volume of silver coins and certificates thus created, to be substituted, dollar for dollar, for the bank notes issued by private corporations, under special privilege granted by law of March 14, 1900, and prior national banking laws, the remaining portion of the banknotes to be replaced with full legal tender government paper money, and its volume so controlled as to maintain at all times a stable money market and a stable price level.

We demand a graduated income and inheritance tax, to the end that aggregated wealth shall bear its just proportion of taxation.

We demand that postal savings banks shall be established by government for the safe deposit of the savings of the people and to facilitate exchange.

With Thomas Jefferson we declare the land, including all natural sources of wealth, the inalienable heritage of the people. Government should so act as to secure homes for the people and prevent land monopoly. The original homestead policy should be enforced, and future settlers upon the public domain should be entitled to a free homestead, while all who have paid an acreage price to the government under existing laws should have their homestead rights restored.

Transportation, being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the government should own and operate the railroads in the interest of the people, and on a non-partisan basis, to the end that all may be accorded the same treatment in transportation,

and that the extortion, tyranny and political power now exercised by the great railroad corporations, which result in the impairment, if not the destruction, of the political rights and personal liberty of the citizen, may be destroyed. Such ownership is to be accomplished in a manner consistent with sound public policy. Trusts, the overshadowing evil of the age, are the result and the culmination of the private ownership and control of these great instruments of commerce — money, transportation, and the means of transmission of information — which instruments of commerce are public functions, and which our forefathers declared in the Constitution should be controlled by the people through their Congress, for the public welfare. The one remedy for the trusts is that the ownership and control be assumed and exercised by the people.

We further demand that all tariffs on goods controlled by a trust shall be abolished. To cope with the trust evil the people must act directly without the intervention of representatives, who may be controlled or influenced. We therefore demand direct legislation, giving the people the law-making and veto power under the initiative and referendum. A majority of the people can never be corruptly influenced.

Applauding the valor of our army and navy in the Spanish war, we denounce the conduct of the administration in changing a war for humanity into a war of conquest. The action of the administration in the Philippines is in conflict with all the precedents of our national life; at war with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the plain precepts of humanity. Murder and arson have been our response to the appeals of the people, who asked only to establish a free government in their own land. We demand a stoppage of this war of extermination by the assurance to the Philippines of independence and the protection under a stable government of their own creation. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the American flag are one and inseparable. The island of Porto Rico is a part of the territory of the United States, and by levying special and extraordinary customs duties on the commerce of that island, the administration has violated the Constitution, abandoned the fundamental principles of American liberty, and has striven to give the lie to the contention of our forefathers that there should be no taxation without representation. Out of the imperialism that would force an undesired domination upon the people of the Philippines springs the un-American cry for a large standing army. Nothing in the character or purposes of our people justifies us in ignoring the plain lesson of history, and putting our liberties in jeopardy by assuming the burden of imperialism which is crushing the people of the

Old World. We denounce the administration for its sinister efforts to substitute a standing army for the citizen soldiery, which is the best safeguard of the Republic.

We extend to the brave Boers of South Africa our sympathy and moral support in their patriotic struggle for the right of self-government, and we are unalterably opposed to any alliance, open or covert, between the United States and any other nation that will tend to the destruction of liberty.

And a further manifestation of imperialism is to be found in the mining districts of Idaho. In the Cœur d'Alene soldiers have been used to override miners striving for a greater measure of industrial independence. And we denounce the State government of Idaho, and the federal government for employing the military arm of the government to abridge the civil rights of the people, and to enforce an infamous permit system which denies to laborers their inherent ability and compels them to forswear their manhood and their right before being permitted to seek employment.

The importation of Japanese and other laborers under contract to serve monopolistic corporations is a notorious and flagrant violation of the immigrant laws. We demand that the federal government shall take cognizance of this menacing evil, and suppress it, under existing laws. We further pledge ourselves to strive for the enactment of more stringent laws for the exclusion of Mongolian and Malayan immigration.

We endorse municipal ownership of public utilities, and declare that the advantages which have accrued to the public under that system would be multiplied a hundredfold by its extension to natural inter-State monopolies.

Mr. Milford W. Howard, of Alabama, was the temporary, and Mr. W. L. Peck, of Georgia, the permanent, president of the convention of Middle-of-the-Road Populists at Cincinnati, on May 9. It was reported that about seven hundred delegates were in attendance, and that every State and Territory in the Union was represented, except Arizona, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Vermont. Evidently the States were quite irregularly represented, inasmuch as objection was made to the one delegate from Kansas casting the entire number of votes, eighty-six, to which the State was entitled, and he was obliged to be satisfied with the eleven votes assigned to his congressional district. Two votes were taken for a nomination of a candidate for President. On the second trial Wharton Barker, of Pennsylvania, received 370 votes to 336 for Milford W. Howard, of Alabama. Ignatius Donnelly, of

Minnesota, was nominated* by acclamation for Vice-President. The following platform was adopted: —

The People's party of the United States, assembled in national convention this 10th day of May, 1900, affirming our unshaken belief in the cardinal tenets of the People's party as set forth in the Omaha platform, and pledging ourselves anew to continued advocacy of these grand principles of human liberty, until right shall triumph over might and love over greed, do adopt and proclaim this declaration of faith:

We demand the initiative and referendum and the imperative mandate for such changes of existing fundamental and statute law as will enable the people in their sovereign capacity to propose and compel the enactment of such laws as they desire, to reject such as they deem injurious to their interests, and to recall unfaithful public servants.

We demand the public ownership and operation of those means of communication, transportation and production which the people may elect, such as railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, coal mines, etc.

The land, including all natural sources of wealth, is a heritage of the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes, and alien ownership of land should be prohibited. All land now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs and all lands now owned by aliens should be reclaimed by the Government and held for actual settlers only.

A scientific and absolute paper money, based upon the entire wealth and population of the Nation, not redeemable in any specific commodity, but made a full legal tender for all debts and receivable for all taxes and public dues and issued by the Government only without the intervention of banks and in sufficient quantity to meet the demands of commerce, is the best currency that can be devised; but until such a financial system is secured, which we shall press for adoption, we favor the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the legal ratio of 16 to 1.

We demand the levy and collection of a graduated tax on incomes and inheritances, and a constitutional amendment to secure the same, if necessary.

We demand the election of President, Vice-President, Federal Judges and United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

We are opposed to trusts, and declare the contention between the old parties on the monopoly question is a sham battle, and that no solution of this mighty problem is possible without the adoption of the principles of public ownership of public utilities.

The next convention, in point of time, was that of the So-

cialist-Labor party, which was held in New York city on June 2. On the 6th it nominated for President Joseph Malloney of Massachusetts, and for Vice-President Valentine Rummel of Pennsylvania. It readopted the platform of 1896, as follows:—

The Socialist Labor party of the United States, in convention assembled, reasserts the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. With the founders of the American Republic we hold that the purpose of government is to secure every citizen in the enjoyment of this right; but in the light of our social conditions we hold, furthermore, that no such right can be exercised under a system of economic inequality, essentially destructive of life, of liberty and of happiness.

With the founders of this Republic we hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be owned and controlled by the whole people; but in the light of our industrial development we hold, furthermore, that the true theory of economics is that the machinery of production must likewise belong to the people in common. To the obvious fact that our despotic system of economics is the direct opposite of our democratic system of politics can plainly be traced the existence of a privileged class, the corruption of government by that class, the alienation of public property, public franchises and public functions to that class, and the abject dependence of the mightiest of nations upon that class.

Again, through the perversion of democracy to the ends of plutocracy, labor is robbed of the wealth which it alone produces, is denied the means of self-employment, and, by compulsory idleness in wage slavery, is even deprived of the necessities of life. Human power and natural forces are thus wasted, that the plutocracy may rule. Ignorance and misery, with all their concomitant evils, are perpetuated, that the people may be kept in bondage. Science and invention are diverted from their humane purpose to the enslavement of women and children.

Against such a system the Socialist Labor party once more enters its protest. Once more it reiterates its fundamental declaration that private property in the natural sources of production and in the instruments of labor is the obvious cause of all economic servitude and political dependence. The time is fast coming when, in the natural course of social evolution, this system, through the destructive action of its failures and crises on the one hand, and the constructive tendencies of its trusts and other capitalistic combinations on the other hand, shall have worked out its own downfall.

We therefore call upon the wage workers of the United States, and upon all other honest citizens, to organize under the banner

of the Socialist Labor party into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them by taking possession of the public powers; so that, held together by an indomitable spirit of solidarity under the most trying conditions of the present class struggle, we may put a summary end to that barbarous struggle by the abolition of classes, the restoration of the land and of all the means of production, transportation and distribution to the people as a collective body, and the substitution of the coöperative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder; a Commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization.

The Republican National Convention met at Philadelphia on June 19. There was no contention over the platform, as there was in the convention of 1896, and the nomination of Mr. McKinley for a second term with absolute unanimity on the part of the delegates and the Republicans of the country, was fully assured. Almost the only active interest in the proceedings of the convention was aroused over the nomination for Vice-President. Many names were proposed, and there was eager canvassing in behalf of some of them. But the movement in favor of Theodore Roosevelt, of New York, enlisted the most ardent support. Mr. Roosevelt was at the time governor of New York, and openly avowed his anxious desire to be nominated and reëlected to that position. He expressed with equal frankness his unwillingness to be nominated as a candidate for Vice-President. There was a strong pressure on the part of his fellow delegates from New York—for he was a member of the convention—to give him the national nomination; but that movement was credited to a desire on the part of the so-called leaders of the party in New York to get rid of him as a candidate for governor. Had the sentiment in his favor been confined to his own State he would have resisted to the last and refused to accept a nomination. But the West and South were equally favorable to him, and to them, ultimately, he yielded.

The temporary chairman was Senator Edward O. Wolcott, of Colorado, and the permanent president was Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts. On the second day of the convention a proposition was made, similar to the propositions submitted to previous conventions, to change the system of representation by allowing each State to send four delegates at

large and "one additional delegate for each ten thousand votes, or majority fraction thereof cast at the last preceding presidential election for Republican electors." The proposed change was intended to reduce the representation of the Southern States, which furnish few electoral votes to the Republican candidates. It would have reduced the representation of South Carolina and Mississippi each from 18 to 5; of Louisiana from 16 to 6; and of Texas from 30 to 21. It was opposed by the members from the Southern States, and was withdrawn, after a brief discussion.

The Committee on Resolutions reported the following platform, which was unanimously adopted: —

The Republicans of the United States, through their chosen representatives, met in National Convention, looking back upon an unsurpassed record of achievement and looking forward into a great field of duty and opportunity, and appealing to the judgment of their countrymen, make these declarations:

The expectation in which the American people, turning from the Democratic party, intrusted power four years ago to a Republican Chief Magistrate and a Republican Congress has been met and satisfied. When the people then assembled at the polls, after a term of Democratic legislation and administration, business was dead, industry paralyzed and the National credit disastrously impaired. The country's capital was hidden away, and its labor distressed and unemployed. The Democrats had no other plan with which to improve the ruinous conditions which they had themselves produced than to coin silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The Republican party, denouncing this plan as sure to produce conditions even worse than those from which relief was sought, promised to restore prosperity by means of two legislative measures — a protective tariff and a law making gold the standard of value. The people by great majorities issued to the Republican party a commission to enact these laws. This commission has been executed, and the Republican promise is redeemed. Prosperity more general and more abundant than we have ever known has followed these enactments. There is no longer controversy as to the value of any Government obligation. Every American dollar is a gold dollar, or its assured equivalent, and American credit stands higher than that of any nation. Capital is fully employed and labor everywhere is profitably occupied. No single fact can more strikingly tell the story of what Republican government means to the country than this — that while during the whole period of one hundred and seven years, from 1790 to 1897, there was an excess of exports

over imports of only \$383,028,497, there has been in the short three years of the present Republican Administration an excess of exports over imports in the enormous sum of \$1,483,537,094.

And while the American people, sustained by this Republican legislation, have been achieving these splendid triumphs in their business and commerce, they have conducted, and in victory concluded, a war for liberty and human rights. No thought of National aggrandizement tarnished the high purpose with which American standards were unfurled. It was a war unsought and patiently resisted, but when it came the American Government was ready. Its fleets were cleared for action. Its armies were in the field, and the quick and signal triumph of its forces on land and sea bore equal tribute to the courage of American soldiers and sailors and to the skill and foresight of Republican statesmanship. To ten millions of the human race there was given "a new birth of freedom," and to the American people a new and noble responsibility.

We indorse the Administration of William McKinley. Its acts have been established in wisdom and in patriotism, and at home and abroad it has distinctly elevated and extended the influence of the American Nation. Walking untried paths and facing unforeseen responsibilities, President McKinley has been in every situation the true American patriot and the upright statesman, clear in vision, strong in judgment, firm in action, always inspiring and deserving the confidence of his countrymen.

In asking the American people to indorse this Republican record and to renew their commission to the Republican party, we remind them of the fact that the menace to their prosperity has always resided in Democratic principles, and no less in the general incapacity of the Democratic party to conduct public affairs. The prime essential of business prosperity is public confidence in the good sense of the Government and in its ability to deal intelligently with each new problem of administration and legislation. That confidence the Democratic party has never earned. It is hopelessly inadequate, and the country's prosperity when Democratic success at the polls is announced halts and ceases in mere anticipation of Democratic blunders and failures.

We renew our allegiance to the principle of the gold standard, and declare our confidence in the wisdom of the legislation of the LVith Congress, by which the parity of all our money and the stability of our currency upon a gold basis have been secured. We recognize that interest rates are a potent factor in production and business activity, and for the purpose of further equalizing and of further lowering the rates of interest we favor such monetary legislation as will enable the varying needs of the season and of all

sections to be promptly met, in order that trade may be evenly sustained, labor steadily employed and commerce enlarged. The volume of money in circulation was never so great per capita as it is to-day. We declare our steadfast opposition to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. No measure to that end could be considered which was without the support of the leading commercial countries of the world. However firmly Republican legislation may seem to have secured the country against the peril of base and discredited currency, the election of a Democratic President could not fail to impair the country's credit and to bring once more into question the intention of the American people to maintain upon the gold standard the parity of their money circulation. The Democratic party must be convinced that the American people will never tolerate the Chicago platform.

We recognize the necessity and propriety of the honest coöperation of capital to meet new business conditions, and especially to extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but we condemn all conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, to create monopolies, to limit production or to control prices, and favor such legislation as will effectively restrain and prevent all such abuses, protect and promote competition and secure the rights of producers, laborers and all who are engaged in industry and commerce.

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified and maintained. By protecting the home market competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity for the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates, higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them finally to enter the markets of the world.

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce, in return for free foreign markets.

In the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands, the extension of opportunities of education for working children, the raising of the age limit for child labor, the protection of free labor as against contract convict labor, and an effective system of labor insurance.

Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The National defence and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade carrying fleets of the world.

The Nation owes a debt of profound gratitude to the soldiers and sailors who have fought its battles, and it is the Government's duty to provide for the survivors and for the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the country's wars. The pension laws, founded in this just sentiment, should be liberal, and should be liberally administered, and preference should be given wherever practicable with respect to employment in the public service to soldiers and sailors and to their widows and orphans.

We commend the policy of the Republican party in maintaining the efficiency of the Civil Service. The Administration has acted wisely in its effort to secure for public service in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippine Islands only those whose fitness has been determined by training and experience. We believe that employment in the public service in these territories should be confined as far as practicable to their inhabitants.

It was the plain purpose of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution to prevent discrimination on account of race or color in regulating the elective franchise. Devices of State governments, whether by statutory or constitutional enactment, to avoid the purpose of this amendment are revolutionary and should be condemned.

Public movements looking to a permanent improvement of the roads and highways of the country meet with our cordial approval, and we recommend this subject to the earnest consideration of the people and of the Legislatures of the several States.

We favor the extension of the rural free delivery service wherever its extension may be justified.

In further pursuance of the constant policy of the Republican party to provide free homes on the public domain, we recommend adequate National legislation to reclaim the arid lands of the United States, reserving control of the distribution of water for irrigation to the respective States and Territories.

We favor home rule for the early admission to Statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona and Oklahoma.

The Dingley act, amended to provide sufficient revenue for the conduct of the war, has so well performed its work that it has been possible to reduce the war debt in the sum of \$40,000,000. So ample

are the Government's revenues and so great is the public confidence in the integrity of its obligations that its newly funded 2 per cent bonds sell at a premium. The country is now justified in expecting, and it will be the policy of the Republican party to bring about, a reduction of the war taxes.

We favor the construction, ownership, control and protection of an isthmian canal by the Government of the United States. New markets are necessary for the increasing surplus of our farm products. Every effort should be made to open and obtain new markets, especially in the Orient, and the Administration is warmly to be commended for its successful effort to commit all trading and colonizing nations to the policy of the open door in China.

In the interest of our expanding commerce we recommend that Congress create a department of commerce and industries in the charge of a secretary with a seat in the Cabinet.

The United States consular system should be reorganized under the supervision of this new department, upon such a basis of appointment and tenure as will render it still more serviceable to the Nation's increasing trade.

The American Government must protect the person and property of every citizen wherever they are wrongfully violated or placed in peril.

We congratulate the women of America upon their splendid record of public service in the volunteer aid association, and as nurses in camp and hospital during the recent campaigns of our armies in the Eastern and Western Indies, and we appreciate their faithful coöperation in all works of education and industry.

President McKinley has conducted the foreign affairs of the United States with distinguished credit to the American people. In releasing us from the vexatious conditions of a European alliance for the government of Samoa his course is especially to be commended. By securing to our undivided control the most important island of the Samoan group and the best harbor in the Southern Pacific, every American interest has been safeguarded.

We approve the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States.

We commend the part taken by our Government in the Peace Conference at The Hague.

We assert our steadfast adherence to the policy announced in the Monroe Doctrine. The provisions of The Hague Convention were wisely regarded when President McKinley tendered his friendly offices in the interest of peace between Great Britain and the South African republics. While the American Government must continue the policy prescribed by Washington, affirmed by every succeeding President and imposed upon us by The Hague

Treaty, of non-intervention in European controversies, the American people earnestly hope that a way may soon be found, honorable alike to both contending parties, to terminate the strife between them.

In accepting by the Treaty of Paris the just responsibility of our victories in the Spanish war the President and the Senate won the undoubted approval of the American people. No other course was possible than to destroy Spain's sovereignty throughout the West Indies and in the Philippine Islands. That course created our responsibility before the world, and with the unorganized population whom our intervention had freed from Spain, to provide for the maintenance of law and order, and for the establishment of good government and for the performance of international obligations. Our authority could not be less than our responsibility, and wherever sovereign rights were extended it became the high duty of the Government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples.

The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law.

To Cuba independence and self-government were assured in the same voice by which war was declared, and to the letter this pledge will be performed.

The Republican party upon its history, and upon this declaration of its principles and policies, confidently invokes the considerate and approving judgment of the American people.

On the third day of the convention William McKinley, of Ohio, was nominated for President and Theodore Roosevelt, of New York, for Vice-President. In each case the roll of the States was called and the vote was unanimous. But Mr. Roosevelt received one vote less than the 926 given to Mr. McKinley, as his own vote was withheld.

The National Prohibition party held its convention at Chicago on June 27, and the following day. Samuel Dickie, of Michigan, was the president of the convention, which consisted of more than seven hundred delegates, representing forty States of the Union. There was an earnest contest in the committee on Resolutions over the question whether the platform should express the principles of the party on the single subject of the liquor traffic, or should be a "broad" platform and treat of other questions of the day, as had been the custom of the party in the past. In the end the victory was with those who advocated a platform of a single plank. The controversy

was not carried into the convention, and the platform as reported, was adopted, in the following terms : —

The National Prohibition party, in convention represented at Chicago, June 27 and 28, 1900, acknowledges Almighty God as the supreme source of all just government. Realizing that this Republic was founded upon Christian principles, and can endure only as it embodies justice and righteousness, and asserting that all authority should seek the best good of all the governed, to this end wisely prohibiting what is wrong and permitting only what is right, hereby records and proclaims :

First, We accept and assert the definition given by Edward Burke, that a party is “ a body of men joined together for the purpose of protecting by their joint endeavor the national interest upon some particular principle upon which they are all agreed.”

We declare that there is no principle now advocated by any other party which could be made a fact in government with such beneficent moral and material results as the principle of prohibition applied to the beverage liquor traffic ; that the national interest could be promoted in no other way so surely and so widely as by its adoption and assertion through a national policy, and a co-operation therein by every state, forbidding the manufacture, sale, exportation, importation and transportation of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes ; that we stand for this as the only principle proposed by any party anywhere for the settlement of a question greater and graver than any other before the American people, and involving more profoundly than any other their moral future and financial welfare ; and that all the patriotic citizenship of this country agreed upon this principle, however much disagreement there may be as to minor considerations and issues, should stand together at the ballot box from this time forward, until prohibition is the established policy of the United States, with a party in power to enforce it and to insure its moral and material benefits.

We insist that such a party, agreed upon this principle and policy, having sober leadership, without any obligation for success to the saloon vote and to those demoralizing combinations, can successfully cope with all other and lesser problems of government, in legislative halls and in the executive chair, and that it is useless for any party to make declarations in its platform as to any questions concerning which there may be serious differences of opinion in its own membership, and as to which, because of such differences, the party could legislate only on a basis of mutual concessions when coming into power.

We submit that the Democratic and Republican parties are alike insincere in their assumed hostility to trusts and monopolies.

They dare not and do not attack the most dangerous of them all, the liquor power. So long as the saloon debauches the citizen and breeds the purchaseable voter, money will continue to buy its way to power. Break down this traffic, elevate manhood, and a sober citizenship will find a way to control dangerous combinations of capital.

We propose, as a first step in the financial problem of the nation, to save more than a billion dollars every year, now annually expended to support the liquor traffic and to demoralize our people. When that is accomplished, conditions will have so improved that with a clearer atmosphere the country can address itself to the questions as to the kind and quantity of currency needed.

Second. We reaffirm as true indisputably the declaration of William Windom when Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of President Arthur, that "Considered socially, financially, politically or morally, the licensed liquor traffic is or ought to be the overwhelming issue in American politics," and that "the destruction of this iniquity stands next on the calendar of the world's progress." We hold that the existence of our party presents this issue squarely to the American people, and lays upon them the responsibility of choice between liquor parties, dominated by distillers and brewers, with their policy of saloon perpetuation, breeding waste, wickedness, woe, pauperism, taxation, corruption and crime, and our one party of patriotic and moral principle, with a policy which defends it from domination by corrupt bosses and which insures it forever against the blighting control of saloon politics.

We face with sorrow, shame and fear the awful fact that this liquor traffic has a grip on our government, municipal, State and National, through the revenue system and saloon sovereignty, which no other party dares to dispute; a grip which dominates the party now in power, from caucus to Congress, from policeman to President, from the rumshop to the White House; a grip which compels the Chief Executive to consent that law shall be nullified in behalf of the brewer, that the canteen shall curse our Army and spread intemperance across the seas, and that our flag shall wave as the symbol of partnership at home and abroad between this Government and the men who defy and defile it for their unholy gain.

Third. We charge upon President McKinley, who was elected to his high office by appeals to Christian sentiment and patriotism almost unprecedented, and by a combination of moral influences never before seen in this country, that, by his conspicuous example as a wine-drinker at public banquets and as a wine-serving host in the White House, he has done more to encourage the liquor

business, to demoralize the temperance habits of young men, and to bring Christian practices and requirements into disrepute, than any other President this Republic has ever had. We further charge upon President McKinley responsibility for the Army canteen, with all its dire brood of disease, immorality, sin and death, in this country, in Cuba, in Porto Rico and the Philippines; and we insist that by his attitude concerning the canteen, and his apparent contempt for the vast number of petitions and petitioners protesting against it, he has outraged and insulted the moral sentiment of this country in such a manner and to such a degree as calls for its righteous uprising and his indignant and effective rebuke.

We challenge denial of the fact that our Chief Executive, as commander in chief of the military forces of the United States, at any time prior to or since March 2, 1899, could have closed every army saloon, called a canteen, by executive order, as President Hayes in effect did before him, and should have closed them, for the same reason that actuated President Hayes; we assert that the act of Congress passed March 2, 1899, forbidding the sale of liquor, "in any post exchange or canteen," by any "officer or private soldier" or by "any other person on any premises used for military purposes in the United States," was and is as explicit an act of prohibition as the English language can frame.

We declare our solemn belief that the Attorney-General of the United States in his interpretation of that law, and the Secretary of War in his acceptance of that interpretation and his refusal to enforce the law, were and are guilty of treasonable nullification thereof, and that President McKinley, through his assent to and indorsement of such interpretation and refusal on the part of officials appointed by and responsible to him, shares responsibility in their guilt; and we record our conviction that a new and serious peril confronts our country, in the fact that its President, at the behest of the beer power, dare and does abrogate a law of Congress, through subordinates removable at will by him and whose acts become his, and thus virtually confesses that laws are to be administered or to be nullified in the interest of a law-defying business, by an Administration under mortgage to such business for support.

Fourth. We deplore the fact that an Administration of this Republic claiming the right and power to carry our flag across seas, and to conquer and annex new territory, should admit its lack of power to prohibit the American saloon on subjugated soil, or should openly confess itself subject to liquor sovereignty under that flag. We are humiliated, exasperated and grieved by the evidence painfully abundant that this Administration's policy of expansion is bearing so rapidly its first fruits of drunkenness, insanity and

crime under the hothouse sun of the tropics; and when the president of the first Philippine Commission says "It was unfortunate that we introduced and established the saloon there, to corrupt the natives and to exhibit the vices of our race," we charge the inhumanity and un-Christianity of this act upon the Administration of William McKinley and upon the party which elected and would perpetuate the same.

Fifth. We declare that the only policy which the Government of the United States can of right uphold as to the liquor traffic, under the National Constitution, upon any territory under the military or civil control of that Government, is the policy of prohibition; that "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," as the Constitution provides, the liquor traffic must neither be sanctioned nor tolerated, and that the revenue policy which makes our Government a partner with distillers and brewers and barkeepers is a disgrace to our civilization, an outrage upon humanity and a crime against God. We condemn the present Administration at Washington because it has repealed the prohibitory laws in Alaska, and has given over the partly civilized tribes there to be the prey of the American grog shop; and because it has entered upon a license policy in our new possessions by incorporating the same in the recent act of Congress in the code of laws for the government of the Hawaiian Islands.

We call general attention to the fearful fact that exportation of liquors from the United States to the Philippine Islands increased in value from \$337 in 1898 to \$467,198 in the first ten months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900; and that while our exportation of liquors to Cuba never reached \$30,000 a year previous to American occupation of that island, our exports of such liquors to Cuba during the fiscal year of 1899 reached the sum of \$629,855.

Sixth. One great religious body (the Baptist) having truly declared of the liquor traffic "that it has no defensible right to exist, that it can never be reformed, and that it stands condemned by its unrighteous fruits as a thing un-Christian, un-American, and perilous utterly to every interest in life;" another great religious body (the Methodist) having as truly asserted and reiterated that "no political party has a right to expect, nor should it receive, the votes of Christian men so long as it stands committed to the license system, or refuses to put itself on record in an attitude of open hostility to the saloon;" other great religious bodies having made similar deliverances, in language plain and unequivocal, as to the liquor traffic and the duty of Christian citizenship in opposition thereto; and the fact being plain and undeniable that the Demo-

cratic party stands for license, the saloon and the canteen, while the Republican party, in policy and administration, stand for the canteen, the saloon and the revenue therefrom, we declare ourselves justified in expecting that Christian voters everywhere shall cease their complicity with the liquor curse by refusing to uphold a liquor party, and shall unite themselves with the only party which upholds the prohibition policy, and which for nearly thirty years has been the faithful defender of the Church, the State, the home and the school, against the saloon, its expanders and perpetrators, their actual and persistent foes.

We insist that no differences of belief as to any other question or concern of government should stand in the way of such a union of moral and Christian citizenship as we hereby invite for the speedy settlement of this paramount moral, industrial, financial and political issue which our party presents; and we refrain from declaring ourselves upon all minor matters as to which differences of opinion may exist that thereby we may offer to the American people a platform so broad that all can stand upon it who desire to see sober citizenship actually sovereign over the allied hosts of evil, sin and crime, in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

We declare that there are but two real parties to-day concerning the liquor traffic — perpetuationists and Prohibitionists; and that patriotism, Christianity, and every interest of genuine and of pure democracy, besides the loyal demands of our common humanity, require the speedy union, in one solid phalanx at the ballot box, of all who oppose the liquor traffic's perpetuation, and who covet endurance for this Republic.

There was a short contest over the nominations, but John G. Woolley, of Illinois, was chosen as the candidate for President by 380 votes to 329 given to Silas C. Swallow, of Pennsylvania; and Henry B. Metcalf, of Rhode Island, was nominated for Vice-President over Thomas R. Carskadden, of West Virginia, and E. L. Eaton, of Iowa.

The Democratic National Convention met at Kansas City on the 4th of July. Governor Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, was the temporary chairman and James D. Richardson, of Tennessee, the permanent president of the convention.

The unanimous nomination of Mr. William J. Bryan as candidate for President was assured, but there was a most earnest controversy over the platform during the period just preceding the convention. A large number of the members of the party,

many of them prominent delegates to the convention were in favor of making the silver issue much less prominent than it was in 1896. Some of these men had supported the ticket four years before, others had not. Some of them were advocates of free coinage, others were not. But they were all opposed to an explicit declaration in favor of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1. Those who still adhered in theory to that measure believed that it would be good policy to subordinate that issue to the newer one of anti-imperialism; and although they did not object to a vague declaration on the silver issue, they did urge that a repetition of the 1896 platform would continue to alienate many voters who would willingly return to their old party allegiance. Former Governor and Senator David B. Hill, of New York, was prominent in pressing this view upon the delegates, as they arrived in Kansas City. Either on his own motion, or at the request of Mr. Bryan, he made the journey to Lincoln, Nebraska, for a consultation with the prospective candidate.

His mission was fruitless. Mr. Bryan maintained that the position taken by the party in 1896 was right; that thousands upon thousands of his supporters in that campaign still regarded the silver issue as the most important of all; and that they would justly denounce it as an act of treachery on his part if he were to accept a nomination on a platform less explicit than that of the preceding canvass. He was unmoved by the argument that by yielding the point he would gain votes in States where an increase of the Democratic strength was greatly needed, and was indispensable to victory. If he agreed that such would be the result, he was also sure that his surrender would be followed by a serious loss of votes in States where he had already gained them on the silver issue.

Notwithstanding the failure to persuade Mr. Bryan to take the view that it would be good policy to let the silver issue drop partly out of sight, and notwithstanding the sentiment that the candidate should have a controlling part in the construction of the platform, the contest was carried into the Committee on Resolutions and the matter was debated long and earnestly. Ultimately Mr. Bryan's wishes were respected, but the vote was close, and attention was called to the fact that the majority in favor of the silver clauses was obtained by the votes of members from States which could by no possibility give Mr. Bryan a single electoral vote. The platform, on which there was no contest in the convention was as follows: —

We, the representatives of the Democratic party of the United States, assembled in National Convention on the anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, do reaffirm our faith in that immortal proclamation of the inalienable rights of man, and our allegiance to the Constitution framed in harmony therewith by the fathers of the Republic.

We hold with the United States Supreme Court that the Declaration of Independence is the spirit of our Government, of which the Constitution is the form and letter. We declare again that all governments instituted among men derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that any government not based upon the consent of the governed is a tyranny; and that to impose upon any people a government of force is to substitute the methods of imperialism for those of a republic. We hold that the Constitution follows the flag and denounce the doctrine that an Executive or Congress, deriving their existence and their powers from the Constitution, can exercise lawful authority beyond it, or in violation of it. We assert that no nation can long endure half republic and half empire, and we warn the American people that imperialism abroad will lead quickly and inevitably to despotism at home.

Believing in these fundamental principles, we denounce the Porto Rican law, enacted by a Republican Congress against the protest and opposition of the Democratic minority, as a bold and open violation of the Nation's organic law and a flagrant breach of National good faith.

It imposes upon the people of Porto Rico a government without their consent, and taxation without representation.

It dishonors the American people by repudiating a solemn pledge made in their behalf by the commanding general of our Army, which the Porto Ricans welcomed to a peaceful and unresisted occupation of their land.

It dooms to poverty and distress a people whose helplessness appeals with peculiar force to our justice and magnanimity. In this, the first act of its imperialistic programme, the Republican party seeks to commit the United States to a colonial policy inconsistent with republican institutions and condemned by the Supreme Court in numerous decisions.

We demand the prompt and honest fulfilment of our pledge to the Cuban people and the world, that the United States has no disposition nor intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the island of Cuba, except for its pacification. The war ended nearly two years ago, profound peace reigns over all the island, and still the Administration keeps the government of the island from its people, while Republican carpetbag officials plun-

der its revenues and exploit the colonial theory to the disgrace of the American people.

We condemn and denounce the Philippine policy of the present Administration. It has embroiled the Republic in an unnecessary war, sacrificed the lives of many of its noblest sons, and placed the United States, previously known and applauded throughout the world as the champion of freedom, in the false and un-American position of crushing with military force the efforts of our former allies to achieve liberty and self-government.

The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperilling our form of government; and as we are not willing to surrender our civilization, or to convert the Republic into an empire, we favor an immediate declaration of the Nation's purpose to give to the Filipinos, first, a stable form of government; second, independence; and third, protection from outside interference such as has been given for nearly a century to the republics of Central and South America.

The greedy commercialism which dictated the Philippine policy of the Republican Administration attempts to justify it with the plea that it will pay, but even this sordid and unworthy plea fails when brought to the test of facts.

The war of "criminal aggression" against the Filipinos, entailing an annual expense of many millions, has already cost more than any possible profit that could accrue from the entire Philippine trade for years to come. Furthermore, when trade is extended at the expense of liberty the price is always too high.

We are not opposed to territorial expansion, when it takes in desirable territory which can be erected into States in the Union, and whose people are willing and fit to become American citizens. We favor trade expansion by every peaceful and legitimate means. But we are unalterably opposed to the seizing or purchasing of distant islands to be governed outside the Constitution and whose people can never become citizens.

We are in favor of extending the Republic's influence among the nations, but believe that influence should be extended not by force and violence, but through the persuasive power of a high and honorable example.

The importance of other questions now pending before the American people is in nowise diminished and the Democratic party takes no backward step from its position on them; but the burning issue of imperialism, growing out of the Spanish war, involves the very existence of the Republic and the destruction of our free institutions. We regard it as the paramount issue of the campaign.

The declaration of the Republican platform adopted at the Philadelphia Convention, held in June, 1900, that the Republican party

"steadfastly adheres to the policy announced in the Monroe Doctrine," is manifestly insincere and deceptive. This profession is contradicted by the avowed policy of that party, in opposition to the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, to acquire and hold sovereignty over large areas of territory and large numbers of people in the Eastern Hemisphere.

We insist on the strict maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in all its integrity, both in letter and in spirit, as necessary to prevent the extension of European authority on these continents and as essential to our supremacy in American affairs. At the same time we declare that no American people shall ever be held by force in unwilling subjection to European authority.

We oppose militarism. It means conquest abroad and intimidation and oppression at home. It means the strong arm which has ever been fatal to free institutions. It is what millions of our citizens have fled from in Europe. It will impose upon our peace-loving people a large standing army, an unnecessary burden of taxation, and would be a constant menace to their liberties. A small standing army and a well disciplined State militia are amply sufficient in time of peace.

This Republic has no place for a vast military establishment, a sure forerunner of compulsory military service and conscription. When the Nation is in danger the volunteer soldier is his country's best defender. The National Guard of the United States should ever be cherished in the patriotic hearts of a free people. Such organizations are ever an element of strength and safety. For the first time in our history and coeval with the Philippine conquest has there been a wholesale departure from our time-honored and approved system of volunteer organization. We denounce it as un-American, undemocratic and unrepugnant and as a subversion of the ancient and fixed principles of a free people.

Private monopolies are indefensible and intolerable. They destroy competition, control the price of raw material and of the finished product, thus robbing both producer and consumer. They lessen the employment of labor and arbitrarily fix the terms and conditions thereof; and deprive individual energy and small capital of their opportunity for betterment. They are the most efficient means yet devised for appropriating the fruits of industry to the benefit of the few at the expense of the many, and, unless their insatiate greed is checked, all wealth will be aggregated in a few hands and the Republic destroyed.

The dishonest paltering with the trust evil by the Republican party in its State and National platforms is conclusive proof of the truth of the charge that trusts are the legitimate product of Republican policies, that they are fostered by Republican laws, and that

they are protected by the Republican Administration in return for campaign subscriptions and political support.

We pledge the Democratic party to an unceasing warfare in Nation, State, and city against private monopoly in every form. Existing laws against trusts must be enforced and more stringent ones must be enacted providing for publicity as to the affairs of corporations engaged in interstate commerce and requiring all corporations to show, before doing business outside of the State of their origin, that they have no water in their stock, and that they have not attempted and are not attempting to monopolize any branch of business or the production of any articles of merchandise; and the whole constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce, the mails and all modes of interstate communication shall be exercised by the enactment of comprehensive laws upon the subject of trusts. Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list, to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

The failure of the present Republican Administration, with an absolute control over all the branches of the National Government, to enact any legislation designed to prevent or even curtail the absorbing power of trusts and illegal combinations, or to enforce the anti-trust laws already on the statute books, proves the insincerity of the high-sounding phrases of the Republican platform.

Corporations should be protected in all their rights and their legitimate interests should be respected, but any attempt by corporations to interfere with the public affairs of the people or to control the sovereignty which creates them should be forbidden under such penalties as will make such attempts impossible.

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure skilfully devised to give to the few favors which they do not deserve, and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear.

We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the Interstate Commerce law as will enable the Commission to protect individuals and communities from discrimination and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates.

We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the National Democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1896 and we reiterate the demand of that platform for an American financial system made by the American people for themselves, which shall restore and maintain a bimetallic price level, and as part of such system the immediate restoration of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

We denounce the currency bill enacted at the last session of Congress as a step forward in the Republican policy which aims to

discredit the sovereign right of the National Government to issue all money, whether coin or paper, and to bestow upon National banks the power to issue and control the volume of paper money for their own benefit. A permanent National bank currency, secured by Government bonds, must have a permanent debt to rest upon, and, if the bank currency is to increase with population and business, the debt must also increase. The Republican currency scheme is, therefore, a scheme for fastening upon the taxpayers a perpetual and growing debt for the benefit of the banks. We are opposed to this private corporation paper circulated as money, but without legal tender qualities, and demand the retirement of National bank notes as fast as Government paper or silver certificates can be substituted for them.

We favor an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and we favor direct legislation wherever practicable.

We are opposed to government by injunction; we denounce the black-list, and favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employees.

In the interest of American labor and the upbuilding of the workingman as the cornerstone of the prosperity of our country, we recommend that Congress create a Department of Labor, in charge of a Secretary, with a seat in the Cabinet, believing that the elevation of the American laborer will bring with it increased production and increased prosperity to our country at home and to our commerce abroad.

We are proud of the courage and fidelity of the American soldiers and sailors in all our wars; we favor liberal pensions to them and their dependents; and we reiterate the position taken in the Chicago platform in 1896, that the fact of enlistment and service shall be deemed conclusive evidence against disease and disability before enlistment.

We favor the immediate construction, ownership and control of the Nicaraguan Canal by the United States, and we denounce the insincerity of the plank in the Republican National platform for an Isthmian canal, in the face of the failure of the Republican majority to pass the bill pending in Congress. We condemn the Hay-Pauncefote treaty as a surrender of American rights and interests, not to be tolerated by the American people.

We denounce the failure of the Republican party to carry out its pledges to grant statehood to the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma, and we promise the people of those Territories immediate statehood, and home rule during their condition as Territories; and we favor home rule and a territorial form of government for Alaska and Porto Rico.

•

We favor an intelligent system of improving the arid lands of the West, storing the waters for the purposes of irrigation, and the holding of such lands for actual settlers.

We favor the continuance and strict enforcement of the Chinese Exclusion law and its application to the same classes of all Asiatic races.

Jefferson said : " Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." We approve this wholesome doctrine and earnestly protest against the Republican departure which has involved us in so-called world politics, including the diplomacy of Europe and the intrigue and land grabbing in Asia, and we especially condemn the ill concealed Republican alliance with England, which must mean discrimination against other friendly nations, and which has already stifled the Nation's voice while liberty is being strangled in Africa.

Believing in the principles of self-government and rejecting, as did our forefathers, the claims of monarchy, we view with indignation the purpose of England to overwhelm with force the South African Republics. Speaking, as we believe, for the entire American Nation, except its Republican officeholders, and for all free men everywhere, we extend our sympathy to the heroic burghers in their unequal struggle to maintain their liberty and independence.

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and which threaten the perpetuation of the oppressive war levies. We oppose the accumulation of a surplus to be squandered in such barefaced frauds upon the taxpayers as the Shipping Subsidy bill, which, under the false pretence of fostering American shipbuilding, would put unearned millions into the pockets of favorite contributors to the Republican campaign fund. We favor the reduction and speedy repeal of the war taxes, and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

Believing that our most cherished institutions are in great peril, that the very existence of our constitutional Republic is at stake, and that the decision now to be rendered will determine whether or not our children are to enjoy those blessed privileges of free government which have made the United States great, prosperous and honored, we earnestly ask for the foregoing declaration of principles the hearty support of the liberty-loving American people, regardless of previous party affiliations.

On the third day of the convention, July 6, William J. Bryan was unanimously nominated as a candidate for President. The convention voted for a candidate for Vice-President with the

result that Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, had $559\frac{1}{2}$ votes, David B. Hill, of New York, 200, Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota, $112\frac{1}{2}$, and there were many scattering votes. Before the result was declared all the votes for other candidates were transferred to Mr. Stevenson, and he was unanimously nominated.

The Silver Republican party also held its convention at Kansas City on July 4. Senator Henry M. Teller, of Colorado, was the temporary Chairman, and Judge L. W. Brown, of Ohio, the permanent President. It was a mass convention rather than one made up of duly elected delegates. Although twenty-one States were reported to be represented, the number of persons who acted in the convention from the several States varied greatly, from 287 reported from Kansas, and one hundred or more from three other States to less than a score each from ten other States, one of which, Texas, sent but two members. The whole number reported was 1057. The convention, on July 6, accepted Mr. Bryan as candidate for President. Many of the members wished to add to the ticket the name of Mr. Towne, the candidate of the Fusion Populists for Vice-President, and that action was prevented only by the most earnest argument and persuasion by those who regarded such action as a disastrous division of the voters who favored Mr. Bryan's candidacy. Mr. Towne joined in the opposition to the designation of himself as a candidate. Ultimately the convention referred the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President to the national committee, by which the nomination of Mr. Stevenson was endorsed. The following platform was adopted:—

We, the Silver Republican party, in National Convention assembled, declare these as our principles, and invite the coöperation of all who agree therewith :

We recognize that the principles set forth in the Declaration of American Independence are fundamental and everlastingly true in their application to governments among men. We believe the patriotic words of Washington's farewell address to be the words of soberness and wisdom, inspired by the spirit of right and truth. We treasure the words of Jefferson as priceless gems of American statesmanship. We hold in sacred remembrance the patriotism of Lincoln, who was the great interpreter of American history and the apostle of human rights and of industrial freedom, and we declare, as was declared by the convention that nominated the great Emancipator, that the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal

Constitution, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.

We declare our adherence to the principles of bimetallism as the right basis of a monetary system under our National Constitution, a principle that found place repeatedly in Republican platforms from the demonetization of silver in 1873 to the St. Louis Republican Convention of 1896. Since that Convention a Republican Congress and a Republican President, at the dictation of the trusts and money power, have passed and approved a currency bill which in itself is a repudiation of the doctrine of bimetallism advocated theretofore by the President and every great leader of his party. This currency law destroys the full money power of the silver dollar, provides for the payment of all Government obligations and the redemption of all forms of paper money in gold alone, retires the time-honored and patriotic greenback, constituting one-sixth of the money in circulation, and surrenders to banking corporations the sovereign function of issuing all paper money, thus enabling these corporations to control the prices of labor and property, and increasing the power of the banks to create panics and bring disaster upon business enterprises. The provision of this currency law making the bonded debt of the Nation payable in gold alone changes the contract between the Government and the bondholders to the advantage of the latter, and is in direct opposition to the declaration of the Matthews resolution passed by Congress in 1878, for which resolution the present Republican President, then a member of Congress, voted, as did also all leading Republicans, both in the House and Senate. We demand the repeal of this currency law, and declare that we shall not cease our efforts until there has been established in its place a monetary system based upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold into money at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, by the independent action of the United States, under which system all money shall be issued by the Government, and all money coined and issued shall be a full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, without exception.

We approve a graduated tax upon incomes; and if necessary to accomplish this, we favor an amendment to the Constitution.

We believe that United States Senators should be elected by direct vote of the people, and we favor such amendment of the Constitution and such legislation as may be necessary to that end.

We favor the maintenance and the extension wherever prac-

ticable of the merit system in public service, appointments to be made according to fitness, competitively ascertained, and public servants to be retained in office only so long as shall be compatible with the efficiency of the service.

Combinations, trusts and monopolies, contrived and created for the purpose of controlling the prices and quantity of articles supplied to the public, are unjust, oppressive and unlawful. Not only do these unlawful conspiracies fix the prices of commodities, but they invade every branch of State and National government with their polluting influences, and control the actions of their employés and dependents, politically, until such control imperils society and the liberty of the citizen. We demand the most stringent laws for their suppression and the most severe punishment of their promoters and maintainers and the energetic enforcement of such laws by the courts.

We believe the Monroe Doctrine to be sound in principle and a wise National policy, and we demand a firm adherence thereto. We condemn those acts of the Administration inconsistent with it, and which have tended to make us parties to the interests, and to involve us in the controversies of European nations, and especially the recognition by pending treaty of the right of England to be considered in the construction of an interoceanic canal.

We are in favor of the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal, to be built, owned and defended by the government of the United States.

We observe with anxiety, and regard with disapproval, the increasing ownership of American lands by aliens; and their growing control over our internal transportation, natural resources and public utilities. We demand legislation to protect our public domain, our natural resources, our franchises and our internal commerce; and to keep them free from, and to maintain their independence of, all foreign monopolies, institutions and influences; and we declare our opposition to the leasing of the public lands of the United States, whereby corporations and syndicates shall be able to secure control thereof, and thus monopolize the public domain, the heritage of the people.

We approve of the principle of direct legislation, and favor the application of the same to nominations.

In view of their great sacrifices made, and patriotic services rendered, we are in favor of liberal pensions to deserving soldiers and sailors, their widows, orphans and other dependents. We believe that enlistment and service should be accepted as conclusive proof that the soldier was free from disease and disability at the time of his enlistment. We condemn the present administration of the pension laws.

We tender to the patriotic people of the South African republics our sympathy, and express our admiration for them in their heroic struggle to preserve their political freedom and maintain their national existence. We declare the destruction of these republics and the subjugation of their people to be a crime against civilization. We believe this sympathy should have been voiced by the American Congress, as was done in the case of the French, Greeks, Hungarians, Poles, Armenians and the Cubans, and as the traditions of this country would have dictated.

We declare the Porto Rican tariff law to be not only a serious but a dangerous departure from the principles of our form of government.

We believe in the republican form of government; and we are opposed to monarchy, and to the whole theory of imperialistic control. We believe in self-government, a government by the consent of the governed; and are unalterably opposed to a government based upon force. It is incontrovertible that the inhabitants of the Philippine archipelago cannot be made citizens of the United States without endangering our civilization. We are therefore in favor of applying to the Philippines the principle we are solemnly and publicly pledged to observe in the case of Cuba.

We demand that our Nation's promise to Cuba shall be fulfilled in every particular.

There being no longer any necessity for collecting war taxes, we demand relief from the taxes levied to carry on the war with Spain.

We favor the immediate admission into the Union of States of the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma.

We believe the National Government should lend encouragement and assistance toward the reclamation of the arid lands of the United States; and to that end, we are in favor of a comprehensive survey thereof, and an immediate ascertainment of the water supply available for such reclamation, and we believe it to be the duty of the general Government to provide for the construction of storage reservoirs and irrigation works so that the water supply of the arid region may be utilized to the greatest possible extent in the interest of the people, while preserving all rights of the States.

Transportation is a public necessity, and the means and methods of it are matters of public concern. Transportation companies exercise an unwarranted power over industries, business and commerce, and should be made to serve the public interests without making unreasonable charges or unjust discriminations.

We observe with satisfaction the growing sentiment among the people in favor of the public ownership and operation of public utilities,

We are in favor of expanding our commerce in the interest of American labor and for the benefit of all our people by every honest and peaceful means.

We are opposed to the importation of Asiatic laborers in competition with American labor; and favor a more rigid enforcement of the laws relating thereto.

Our creed and our history justify the nations of the earth in expecting that, wherever the American flag is unfurled in authority, there human liberty and political freedom shall be found. We protest against the adoption of any policy that will change, in the thought of the world, the meaning of our flag. We insist that it shall never float over any ship or wave at the head of any column directed against the political independence of any people of any race or in any clime. The Silver Republican party of the United States, in the foregoing principles, seeks to perpetuate the spirit, and to adhere to the teachings of Abraham Lincoln.

On July 18 a number of Anti-Imperialists and Gold Democrats met at New York and adopted a declaration to be submitted to the national committee of the organization which nominated Palmer and Buckner in 1896. Inasmuch as it was a select gathering, and as it did not accomplish the object aimed at, the declaration is not given in full. But as, on the other hand, the number of those who held the sentiments expressed in the declaration was undoubtedly larger than that of one or more of the parties which put a ticket in the field, a summary of it deserves a place in the history of the canvass.

We are met [they declared] to devise means to place in nomination a third presidential ticket. We take this course because we are at present faced with the necessity of choosing between two candidates for neither of whom can we conscientiously vote.

The declaration then proceeds to characterize Mr. McKinley, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan in most uncomplimentary terms, which it is not necessary to reproduce, and it announced the purposes of those who adopted it as follows: —

First, a return to the political doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Second, the recognition that not only Cuba and the Philippines, but Porto Rico and Hawaii are entitled to independence.

Third, genuine monetary reform.

Fourth, civil service reform.

Fifth, the abolition of special privilege, whether of tariff or any other origin.

Some of the gentlemen present at this meeting attended the meeting of the national committee of the "National Democratic" party, the name adopted by the Gold Democrats of 1896, who met at Indianapolis on July 25. But after full consideration the committee adopted the following resolutions which, as will be seen, made no reference to the anti-imperial issue:

Resolved. That in the opinion of this committee the nomination of candidates by the National Democratic party for the offices of President and Vice-President is unwise and inexpedient.

Second — That we reaffirm the Indianapolis platform of 1896.

Third — We recommend the State Committees in their respective States to preserve their organizations and take such steps as in their opinion may best subserve the principles of our party, especially in the maintenance of a sound currency, the right of private contract, the independence of the judiciary, and the authority of the President to enforce Federal laws, a covert attack on which is made under the guise of the denunciation of government by injunction.

We urge the voters not to be deceived by the plea that the money question has been finally settled. The specific reiteration of the demand for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by the Kansas City Convention, and the history known of all men in connection therewith, emphasize the danger of this demand. We indorse the action of Congress in passing a bill embodying the gold standard as a step in the right direction. We feel it would be dangerous to elevate to executive power any one hostile to the maintenance and enforcement of this law.

The Anti-Imperialist League held a convention at Indianapolis on August 16, and accepted the nomination of Mr. Bryan, and adopted the following platform: —

This Liberty Congress of Anti-Imperialists recognizes a great National crisis, which menaces the Republic, upon whose future depends in such large measure the hope of freedom throughout the world. For the first time in our country's history the President has undertaken to subjugate a foreign people and to rule them by despotic power. He has thrown the protection of the flag over slavery and polygamy in the Sulu Islands. He has arrogated to himself the power to impose upon the inhabitants of the Philippines government without their consent and taxation without representation. He is waging war upon them for asserting the very principles for the maintenance of which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. He claims for himself and

Congress authority to govern the territories of the United States without constitutional restraint.

We believe in the Declaration of Independence. Its truths, not less self-evident to-day than when first announced by our fathers, are of universal application and cannot be abandoned while government by the people endures.

We believe in the Constitution of the United States. It gives the President and Congress certain limited powers and secures to every man within the jurisdiction of our Government certain essential rights. We deny that either the President or Congress can govern any person outside the Constitution.

We are absolutely opposed to the policy of President McKinley, which proposes to govern millions of men without their consent, which in Porto Rico establishes taxation without representation, and government by the arbitrary will of a legislature unfettered by constitutional restraint, and in the Philippines prosecutes a war of conquest and demands unconditional surrender from a people who are of right free and independent. The struggle of men for freedom has ever been a struggle for constitutional liberty. There is no liberty if the citizen has no right which the Legislature may not invade, if he may be taxed by the Legislature in which he is not represented, or if he is not protected by fundamental law against the arbitrary action of executive power. The policy of the President offers the inhabitants of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines no hope of independence, no prospect of American citizenship, no constitutional protection, no representation in the Congress which taxes them. This is the government of men by arbitrary power without their consent. This is imperialism. There is no room under the free flag of America for subjects. The President and Congress, who derive all their powers from the Constitution, can govern no man without regard to its limitations.

We believe the greatest safeguard of liberty is a free press, and we demand that the censorship in the Philippines, which keeps from the American people the knowledge of what is done in their name, be abolished. We are entitled to know the truth, and we insist that the powers which the President holds in trust for us shall be not used to suppress it.

Because we thus believe, we oppose the reelection of Mr. McKinley. The supreme purpose of the people in this momentous campaign should be to stamp with their final disapproval his attempt to grasp imperial power. A self-governing people can have no more imperative duty than to drive from public life a Chief Magistrate who, whether in weakness or of wicked purpose, has used his temporary authority to subvert the character of their government and to destroy their National ideals.

We, therefore, in the belief that it is essential at this crisis for the American people again to declare their faith in the universal application of the Declaration of Independence and to reassert their will that their servants shall not have or exercise any powers whatever other than those conferred by the Constitution, earnestly make the following recommendations to our countrymen :

First, that, without regard to their views on minor questions of domestic policy, they withhold their votes from Mr. McKinley, in order to stamp with their disapproval what he has done.

Second, that they vote for those candidates for Congress in their respective districts who will oppose the policy of imperialism.

Third, while we welcome any other method of opposing the reelection of Mr. McKinley, we advise direct support of Mr. Bryan as the most effective means of crushing imperialism.

We are convinced of Mr. Bryan's sincerity and of his earnest purpose to secure to the Filipinos their independence. His position and the declarations contained in the platform of his party on the vital issue of the campaign meet our unqualified approval. We recommend that the Executive committees of the American Anti-Imperialist League and its allied leagues continue and extend their organizations, preserving the independence of the movement ; and that they take the most active part possible in the pending political campaign.

Until now the policy which has turned the Filipinos from warm friends to bitter enemies, which has slaughtered thousands of them and laid waste their country, has been the policy of the President. After the next election it becomes the policy of every man who votes to reelect him, and who thus becomes with him responsible for every drop of blood thereafter shed.

The following resolution, proposed from the floor, was added to the platform as reported :

Resolved, That in declaring that the principles of the Declaration of Independence apply to all men, this Congress means to include the negro race in America as well as the Filipinos. We deprecate all efforts, whether in the South or in the North, to deprive the negro of his rights as a citizen under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Still another ticket was nominated by about one hundred independent citizens, who claimed no delegated authority, at a meeting in New York, on September 5. This action seems to have been the outcome of the refusal of the "National Democratic" party, by its national committee, to nominate a ticket in response to the demand of the meeting in New York—

already noticed — of July 18. Senator Donelson Caffery, of Louisiana, was placed in nomination for the presidency, and Archibald M. Howe, of Massachusetts, for the vice-presidency. Both of these gentlemen declined the nomination later in the month, and no further action was taken. The following declaration of principles was made : —

We, citizens of the United States of America, assembled for the purpose of defending the wise and conservative principles which underlie our Government, thus declare our aims and purposes:

We find our country threatened with alternative perils. On the one hand is a public opinion misled by organized forces of commercialism that have perverted a war intended by the people to be a war of humanity into a war of conquest. On the other is a public opinion swayed by demagogic appeals to factional and class passions, the most fatal of diseases to a republic. We believe that either of these influences, if unchecked, would ultimately compass the downfall of our country, but we also believe that neither represents the sober conviction of our countrymen. Convinced that the extension of the jurisdiction of the United States for the purpose of holding foreign people as colonial dependents is an innovation dangerous to our liberties and repugnant to the principles upon which our Government is founded, we pledge our earnest efforts through all constitutional means,

First — To procure the renunciation of all imperial or colonial pretensions with regard to foreign countries claimed to have been acquired through or in consequence of naval or military operations of the last two years.

Second — We further pledge our efforts to secure a single gold standard and a sound banking system.

Third — To secure a public service based on merit only.

Fourth — To secure the abolition of all corrupting special privileges, whether under the guise of subsidies, bounties, undeserved pensions, or trust-breeding tariffs.

The canvass of the year 1900 was characterized by no unusual excitement. The number of candidates for the two chief offices was unprecedentedly large, but there was nothing in the situation to divert from the candidates of the two historic parties to any one of the minor candidacies any considerable body of citizens. The only large group of men, Democrats and Republicans, who could not conscientiously support either McKinley or Bryan — those who were unalterably opposed to the Philippine policy and equally opposed to free silver — found

nothing to attract them in the Prohibition principles or in the several socialistic parties. They reluctantly voted for that one of the candidates whose principles were less repugnant to their own, or refrained from voting altogether.

It is probable that several important events, or series of events, wholly unconnected with American politics, by diverting public attention, rendered the interest in the canvass much less acute than it otherwise would have been. Of these may be mentioned the Boxer uprising in China, the assassination of King Humbert of Italy, the terrible catastrophe at Galveston, and the closing campaigns of the Boer War. The continuance of the war with the Filipino insurgents and the protracted strikes in the anthracite coal region may have had some unascertained effect upon the political sentiments of the people, and upon the vote in November; but that effect was not only unascertained but unperceived.

Aside from the ordinary campaigning by a host of "spell-binders" of both parties, the leading feature of the canvass was the activity of Mr. Bryan on the part of the Democrats, and of Mr. Roosevelt in behalf of the Republicans. Mr. Roosevelt was credited with having made six hundred and seventy-three speeches in twenty-four States. Mr. Bryan's statistics cannot be given, but there were few days when no audiences gathered to hear him, and his travels must have been quite as extensive as those of Mr. Roosevelt.

Although anti-imperialism was announced by the Democratic convention to be the paramount issue of the canvass, and although the declaration was made at the expressed wish of Mr. Bryan, it seems not a prejudiced view of the situation to assert that he found the principle less popular than he expected. Not that he abated in the slightest degree the energy of his opposition to the colonial policy, or that he failed at any time to denounce those who preferred — as he put it — an empire to a republic. But he devoted the larger part of most of his speeches on the stump to the question of the trusts, and to the evils to which organized labor was subject. The silver question, on which he usually touched, briefly but emphatically, also seemed not greatly to interest his hearers. But on the other hand it was the leading topic of Republican orators, and the most effective argument they could adduce was the danger that the gold standard would be endangered should Mr. Bryan be successful. The event proved that in the extreme and

the middle West the sentiment in favor of silver free coinage was far less strong than it was four years before; and thousands of Republicans returned to their allegiance. On the other hand, in the East where such free silver sentiment existed it was to a large degree artificial, and chiefly a product of the desire for party regularity; the "paramount" and other issues of the canvass were more emphasized, and there the Democratic vote increased.

The election took place on November 6. The result is shown in the table on the opposite page.

McKinley lost the votes of Kentucky which he had received in 1896, but he gained those of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming which were carried by Bryan four years before.

The total popular vote was 13,973,071, which was an increase of 36,020 over the vote of 1896. It was to be followed in 1904 by an actual decrease. The causes of the remarkable reversal of a tendency which had always previously been observed, are discussed in a later chapter.

The resolution of Congress preliminary to the count of the electoral votes was more carefully considered and phrased than were similar resolutions in the past. Indeed, in the form in which it was first passed by the Senate it followed closely the language of the resolution adopted by both Houses in 1896. But it was observed by some members of the House of Representatives that it did not use the phraseology of the law, and accordingly it was modified. The difference between the two forms is slight and may seem unimportant at a casual reading. As passed by the Senate, after providing for a joint meeting on the 13th of February, for the appointment of tellers on the part of the two Houses, and for the making of lists of the result by these tellers, the Senate resolution continued:—

The result shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall announce the state of the vote and the persons elected, to the two Houses assembled as aforesaid, which shall be deemed a declaration of the persons elected President and Vice-President of the United States.

In its modified form there was substituted, for the foregoing, these words:—

The result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote,

STATES	POPULAR VOTE 1900								ELECTORAL VOTE	
	McKinley and Roosevelt Republican	Bryan and Stevenson Democratic	Wooley and Metcalf Prohibition	Debs and Harriman Social Democratic	Malloney and Remmel Socialist Labor	Barker and Donnelly Mid-Road Populist	Ellis and Nicholson Union Reform	Leonard and Martin United Christian	McKinley and Roosevelt	Bryan and Stevenson
Alabama . .	55512	97131	2762	-	-	4178	-	-	-	11
Arkansas . .	44800	81142	584	27	-	972	341	-	-	8
California . .	164755	124985	5087	7572	-	-	-	-	9	-
Colorado . .	93072	122733	3790	714	684	389	-	-	-	4
Connecticut . .	102572	74014	1617	1029	908	-	-	-	6	-
Delaware . .	22535	18863	546	57	-	-	-	-	3	-
Florida . .	7420	28007	2234	601	-	1070	-	-	-	4
Georgia . .	35056	81700	1396	-	-	4584	-	-	-	13
Idaho . .	27193	29414	857	-	-	232	-	-	-	3
Illinois . .	597985	503061	17626	9687	1373	1141	572	352	24	-
Indiana . .	336063	309584	13718	2374	663	1438	254	-	15	-
Iowa . .	307808	209265	9502	2742	259	613	-	707	13	-
Kansas . .	185955	162601	3605	1605	-	-	-	-	10	-
Kentucky . .	226801	234899	2814	770	299	2017	-	-	-	13
Louisiana . .	14233	53671	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Maine . .	65412	36822	2585	878	-	-	-	-	6	-
Maryland . .	136185	122238	4574	904	388	-	147	-	8	-
Massachusetts . .	239147	157016	6208	9716	2610	-	-	-	15	-
Michigan . .	310269	211685	11859	2826	903	837	-	-	14	-
Minnesota . .	190461	112901	8555	3065	1329	-	-	-	9	-
Mississippi . .	5753	51706	-	-	-	1644	-	-	-	9
Missouri . .	314092	351922	5965	6139	1294	4244	-	-	-	17
Montana . .	25373	37145	298	708	169	-	-	-	-	3
Nebraska . .	121835	114013	3655	823	-	1104	-	-	8	-
Nevada . .	3849	6347	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
New Hampshire . .	54799	35489	1279	790	-	-	-	-	4	-
New Jersey . .	221754	164879	7190	4611	2081	691	-	-	10	-
New York . .	822013	678462	22077	12869	12621	-	-	-	36	-
North Carolina . .	132997	157733	1006	-	-	830	-	-	-	11
North Dakota . .	35898	20531	731	520	-	111	-	-	3	-
Ohio . .	543918	474882	10203	4847	1588	251	4284	-	23	-
Oregon . .	46526	33385	2536	1494	-	275	-	-	4	-
Pennsylvania . .	712665	424232	27908	4831	2936	638	-	-	32	-
Rhode Island . .	33784	19812	1529	-	1423	-	-	-	4	-
South Carolina . .	3579	47233	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
South Dakota . .	54530	39544	1542	169	-	339	-	-	4	-
Tennessee . .	123180	145356	3860	413	-	1322	-	-	-	12
Texas . .	130641	267432	2644	1846	162	20981	-	-	-	15
Utah . .	47139	45006	209	720	106	-	-	-	3	-
Vermont . .	42569	12849	383	39	-	367	-	-	4	-
Virginia . .	115865	146080	2150	145	167	63	-	-	-	12
Washington . .	57456	44833	2363	2066	866	-	-	-	4	-
West Virginia . .	119829	98807	1692	219	-	268	-	-	6	-
Wisconsin . .	265760	159163	10027	7048	503	-	-	-	12	-
Wyoming . .	14482	10164	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Totals . .	7219525	6358737	209157	94864	33432	50599	5698	1059	292	155

which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice-President of the United States.

In the one case, it will be seen, the President of the Senate was to declare certain persons elected. It was thought advisable, at a time when no question was to arise as to the result, to establish the precedent that the President of the Senate was not to declare any person elected. The procedure thus enjoined was followed strictly at the count of the vote on February 13, 1901, which passed off without an incident outside of the routine.

The inauguration took place on March 4, 1901, with the customary ceremony. But numerous organizations and a vast throng of private citizens made the occasion memorable and impressive. In the procession that accompanied Mr. McKinley from the White House to the Capitol and escorted him back to the official residence were a large number of veterans of the Civil War; the "Rough Riders," — Mr. Roosevelt's regiment during the Spanish War; — a battalion of Porto Rican soldiers, representing the new citizens of the United States; and the full corps of West Point cadets and Annapolis midshipmen. In the parade after the inauguration were fifteen governors of States, mounted. The number of private citizens who were attracted to Washington by simple curiosity or by a desire to testify their regard for the President and Vice-President elect, was unprecedented. The parade after the inauguration was witnessed by tens of thousands who lined Pennsylvania avenue, many deep, all the way from the Capitol to the White House.

The scene in the Senate Chamber when Mr. Roosevelt took the oath as Vice-President was brilliant in the extreme. The Supreme Court, the members of the Cabinet, and the diplomatic corps headed by Lord Pauncefote, in their court costumes, added dignity to the occasion; and the ladies of the Chinese and Japanese legations, in their gorgeous native attire, gave a quaint touch of color to the diplomatic gallery.

After the induction into office of the Vice-President the official and invited witnesses of the ceremony of administering the oath to the President elect proceeded to the east front of the Senate wing of the Capitol. Mr. McKinley took the oath, which was administered by Chief Justice Fuller, and then delivered his inaugural address. Unfortunately a light rain was falling at the time, and the President omitted, in the reading, a part of his address.

II

ROOSEVELT'S ELECTION FOR A "SECOND TERM"

MR. MCKINLEY began his second term under the happiest auspices. The momentous crisis through which the country had passed since the beginning of the war with Spain left him secure in the support of a large majority of the people. If the voters had not, in the preceding November, expressed their approval of the policy of expansion which imposed upon the government the care and control of distant possessions and made it a world power, they had certainly not condemned that policy. Congress had passed an act — the act which of all the President most ardently desired — reëstablishing the system of a protective tariff according to the Republican standard, and the people had not rejected the party which made the tariff, as they had done in 1884, 1890, and 1896, — the last three tariffs enacted. The country was so prosperous under the act, — in consequence of it or in spite of it, as one viewed it from the protective or the free-trade point of view, — that there was no imminent danger of a fresh tariff campaign. Moreover, the prosperity of the country served also to reconcile all but the most irreconcilable to the act establishing the gold standard of money, and the consequent elimination of the silver question from politics, of which it had been a disturbing element for more than twenty years.

Although such was the fortunate situation in home affairs the outlook was, if not reassuring, by no means desperate, so far as the relations of the government to its new dependencies and to certain foreign powers were concerned. The Philippine revolt was not suppressed, but the clouds in that archipelago began to break before the first month of the new term expired; for Aguinaldo was captured by a stratagem in March, and thereafter the violent opposition to American rule was sporadic and futile. Congress had passed an act throwing the entire control and government of the islands upon the President, and arrangements had already been made to transfer the government from military to civil authority, a change which took place,

according to the plans of Governor Taft, on the fourth of July. The possession of distant and insular dependencies raised a group of new and perplexing questions as to the standing of the people inhabiting Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, and as to their relation to and their rights under the Constitution and the laws of the United States. The questions were carried promptly to the Supreme Court for decision. They reached that tribunal in several distinct cases, each of which was to be determined by a ruling on a single point. It resulted that no general opinion, covering the whole subject, was possible. The two cases of chief importance were decided on the same day, May 27, each by a divided court, five justices against four. But the majority, so far as the personnel of the justices comprising it was concerned, was not the same in the two cases, and it was therefore easy for the opponents of what they called imperialism, to maintain that the court overruled itself in the two judgments. Whether they were inconsistent with each other or not, the effect they produced was to sanction all that Congress had done and all that it proposed to do with reference to the government of the outlying territory and the people inhabiting it. The court decided that the territory acquired as the result of the war was a part of the United States, and not foreign; and that the people were not aliens. But on the other hand it decided that, until Congress should so decree, that territory was not a part of the United States in such a sense that the requirement of the Constitution that the taxes imposed by Congress "shall be uniform throughout the United States" applied to them. Consistency might be asserted for the two decisions by advancing the theory that the new territory was a part of the United States as a whole; but that the clause just quoted applied only to such part of the country as was organized into States. But the Court did not maintain, nor did it disclaim, consistency. It simply held that Congress possessed authority to pass any laws it might deem necessary for the government of the newly acquired territory.

The relations of the United States to other powers were absolutely peaceful. But there was one question pending with Great Britain that required delicate handling. The experience of the country during the Spanish War gave a fresh and strong impetus to the public sentiment favorable to the construction of a canal to unite the Atlantic and the Pacific. It was urged with great force that the country must never again be forced,

in time of war, to assemble its naval fleets by steaming around South America. The chief obstacle to an enterprise which encountered scarcely any opposition at home, was the so-called Clayton-Bulwer Treaty with Great Britain. Under that treaty, which was made in 1850, and which, as has been said of it, "has given rise to more questions than it contains articles," the United States was hampered by obligations which successive Secretaries of State during a half-century had vainly endeavored to remove by peaceful negotiation. In its relation to an Isthmian Canal it made Great Britain and the United States partners in the protection and control of such a canal, should a waterway between the oceans be constructed. The treaty was held by American diplomatists to be inconsistent with the undertaking of the United States, in its treaty with Colombia, to guarantee the integrity of Colombian territory. Mr. Blaine, when Secretary of State, argued that Great Britain had abrogated the treaty by certain of its acts, but the British Foreign Secretary did not admit the validity of his argument, and it was never the purpose of any President to act upon the assumption that the treaty was abrogated, unless Great Britain conceded the point. As public opinion in the United States after the Spanish War demanded the construction of an inter-oceanic canal as a government work, it became more than ever important that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty should be abrogated, or at all events modified. For it was clearly against public policy to incur the enormous expense of the undertaking unless, in the end, it would be under the sole control of the government which had borne the entire burden of cost.

On February 5, 1900, Secretary of State John Hay concluded a treaty with Lord Pauncefoot as British plenipotentiary, modifying in important respects the old treaty of 1850. When the treaty was submitted to the Senate for ratification that body made several amendments to the instrument, one of which declared that the new agreement superseded the treaty of 1850. Great Britain rejected the treaty as amended, assigning several reasons for its action. But it was generally understood that it attached importance to the change just mentioned, and to that only. The Foreign Secretary remarked that it was not customary for one party to a treaty to declare it superseded when the subject of supersession had not been discussed. A new treaty was made by Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefoot, November 18, 1901, which was sent to the Senate at the beginning of the

December session, and was ratified on December 16, by a vote of 72 to 6. By that treaty the Clayton-Bulwer agreement was formally superseded, the right of the United States to construct, own, operate, and control a canal was conceded, and the clauses relative to the neutralization of the Suez Canal were incorporated in the agreement, save that the clause forbidding a fortification of the canal was omitted.

The war with Spain was undertaken with the express purpose to liberate Cuba, and with a distinct pledge on the part of Congress not to acquire it as a territory of the United States, but to leave the government to the people of the island. Nevertheless Cuba was held by United States troops and was governed temporarily by a general of its army. Notwithstanding the pledge that was given at the outset, there was clearly a moral obligation resting upon the United States to see that the government of the new republic should be truly representative of the people, that its institutions should be founded upon justice and liberty, and that it should be strong enough, as well as disposed, to maintain justice, liberty and order. It was also the right of the United States, having established the independence of Cuba, to safeguard its own interests. President McKinley had ordered an election of delegates to frame a constitution for Cuba, on July 25, 1900, and the convention met on November 5. It was composed of the most radical and irresponsible elements of the population, and when, after childish dallying with the problem before it, the convention began to consider the details of a constitution the general features of which had been agreed upon, it appeared that there was no purpose on the part of the convention to express obligation, gratitude, or even friendliness to the United States. There was not in the preliminary draft a word of recognition of the service this country had rendered in establishing independence, nor of its interest in the future of the island.

The evident intention of the delegates to obtain the sanction of Congress to a constitution which would enable the new government to become — like many of the Spanish-American republics — a lawless member of the family of nations, a scene of frequent revolutions, and absolved from indebtedness of any sort to the United States, caused much anxiety at Washington. Early in February, 1901, there were several conferences among senators who were members of the Committee on Cuban Relations; and the result was the drafting of an amendment

to be proposed to the pending Army Appropriation Bill. There were consultations with the President and Secretary Root, but the original draft was made by Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut, and the final draft was made by Senators Platt and Spooner. The Democratic senators on the Committee, although opposed to the amendment, patriotically agreed not to filibuster against it, nor to offer factious opposition to it. Mr. Platt offered the amendment on February 25, when only one week of the session and of the Congress remained. It was adopted on the 27th, by a strict party vote, yeas 43, nays 20, was agreed to by the House of Representatives, and became a law on March 2. The famous "Platt Amendment" consisted of a preamble and eight clauses. The preamble repeated the declaration of the intention of the government as set forth in the "Teller Amendment" to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people," but added that that action was to be taken "so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba substantially as follows": —

The first three of the following clauses are all that need be quoted in full.

I. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise lodgment in or control over any portion of the island.

II. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

III. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

The fourth clause ratified and validated all the acts of the United States during the military occupation of the island.

By the fifth the government was to bind itself to continue the sanitation work already performed. The sixth omitted the Isle of Pines, for the time being, from the boundaries of Cuba. The seventh provided for the sale or lease to the United States of land for coaling or naval stations. The eighth embodied an engagement to make a permanent treaty with the United States in accordance with the foregoing provisions.

Great reluctance to accept the conditions on which the government might be established was manifested by the convention. It was once voted not to incorporate the Platt amendment in the constitution, but the futility of the entire proceedings should the convention persist in its refusal finally became so apparent that the amendment was appended to the constitution. An election was held at the end of the year, and the government of the island was turned over to the people on the 4th of July, 1902. In the interval there was not a little angry discussion of the matter by radical Cubans. The motives of the United States in imposing conditions which were declared to be humiliating, were attacked. There was a suspicion of sinister intentions. Yet the terms were not harsh; they were calculated to secure the independence of the island, and not to impair it; and in particular that clause which authorized intervention by the United States to secure the island from a succession of revolutionary outbreaks, was soon justified by events in Cuba. More than once before the inauguration of Señor Palma as the first president suspicion was entertained both in Cuba and by opposition journals in the United States that the administration had a secret purpose to bring about the annexation of the island. But events showed that there was no such purpose, and the pledge of the government at the time war with Spain was declared, was strictly and honorably performed.

There were several other matters in the foreign relations that belong in point of time to the closing months of President McKinley's first, and the beginning of his second term. They had, however, no bearing upon the political situation, and therefore require a brief mention only. The Venezuela trouble, which caused much diplomatic correspondence later, was not yet at an acute stage. Negotiations were on foot, and indeed took the form of a treaty for the cession of the Danish West Indies to the United States; but in the end King Christian and the Danish Parliament refused to sanction the cession. The government joined with other powers in demanding in-

demnity from China on account of losses and expenses suffered by reason of the Boxer insurrection. The demands of the United States were moderate, and when it was found that the sum asked for and paid exceeded the actual loss, the excess was returned to China. If it be added that the question of the fisheries on the coasts of Canada and Newfoundland engaged much of the attention of the government, it is a statement that would be true of some period in almost every President's term of office.

It will be seen from the foregoing survey of the situation at home and abroad that the administration entered upon its duties under extremely favorable conditions. Save for the unsatisfactory outlook in the Philippines there was nothing to cause anxiety. Such foreign questions as were unsettled were fully under control. Politically the party in power was strong, and the several departments worked in harmony. The new House of Representatives, elected at the same time as the President, consisted of 198 Republicans, 153 Democrats, and 5 independents. The Senate, as it met on the 4th of March, consisted of 56 Republicans, 29 Democrats, and 5 independents. There were two vacancies in the Senate, and one in the House.

On the 29th of April the President set out for a long tour, in the course of which he was to visit twenty-four States. He was to go by the southern route, by way of New Orleans to the Pacific Coast, and to return by the northern route, and the Yellowstone Park. But Mrs. McKinley, who accompanied him, was taken so seriously ill at San Francisco that the rest of the tour was abandoned, and the party returned East by the shortest line.

There is reason to think that the President cherished a definite purpose to make his second term noteworthy by a great increase in the foreign trade of the country, and to reach that end by an important modification of the commercial policy. Such a purpose is hinted at in his inaugural message, and it reappears in more and more developed form in his later speeches. The passage in the inaugural address is brief but pregnant.

Our diversified productions are increasing in such unprecedented volume as to admonish us of the necessity of still further enlarging our foreign markets by broader commercial relations. For this purpose reciprocal trade arrangements with other nations should, in liberal spirit, be carefully cultivated and promoted.

In his speech at Memphis, on the Western tour just mentioned, he said, —

It is your business as well as mine to see to it that an industrial policy shall be pursued in the United States that shall open up the widest markets in every part of the world for the products of American soil and American manufacture. We can now supply our own markets. . . . We must open new ones for our surplus.

By far the fullest expression of what was in his mind is contained in the last speech he ever delivered. It is a singular fact that both parties to the nation-old controversy upon the question of protection and free trade, quote more or less fully from his utterance on that occasion — the one party maintaining that he had no intention beyond joining a policy of reciprocity to an unyielding policy of protection; the other that he perceived that the policy of protection must be modified. Inasmuch as the controversy continues a decade after the words were spoken, the text of his remarks upon the subject should be given in full. The occasion of the speech was a visit to the Buffalo Pan-American Exhibition, on September 5, 1901. After speaking of the state of "unexampled prosperity" in all parts of the country and in every branch of industry, he proceeded : —

We have a vast and intricate business built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or undue selfishness. No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The greatest skill and wisdom on the part of the manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial enterprises which have grown to such great proportions affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing

were possible it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad? Then, too, we have inadequate steamship service. New lines of steamers have already been put in commission between the Pacific Coast ports of the United States and those on the western coast of Mexico and Central and South America. These should be followed up with direct steamship lines between the eastern coast of the United States and South American ports. One of the needs of the times is direct commercial lines from our vast fields of production to the fields of consumption that we have but barely touched. Next in advantage to having the thing to sell is to have the conveyance to carry it to the buyer. We must increase our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans. These will not only be profitable in a commercial sense; they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go. We must build the Isthmian Canal, which will unite the two oceans and give a straight line of water communication with the western coasts of Central and South America and Mexico. The construction of a Pacific cable cannot be longer postponed.

On the day following the delivery of this speech, September 6, the President was shot twice, while receiving his fellow citizens. At first strong hopes were entertained that he would recover, but his wounds were mortal, and he died on September 14. His assassin was an anarchist of foreign extraction, who was executed for his crime during the following month.

Vice-President Roosevelt was summoned to Buffalo when the President's condition was seen to be desperate, and when

death removed him, Mr. Roosevelt immediately took the oath of office, by the advice of Mr. Root, the Secretary of War. In doing so he said, "It shall be my aim to continue absolutely unbroken the policy of President McKinley, which has given peace, prosperity, and honor to our beloved country." By proclamation he appointed the 19th of September, which was to be the day of the President's funeral, as "a day of mourning and prayer," and recommended to all the people that on that day they should assemble in their respective houses of worship and hold a memorial service for the murdered President. The third assassination of a President in office in a period of less than forty years excited universal grief and indignation. Of the three victims Mr. McKinley was the best beloved. The full appreciation of Lincoln's character came after his death. Garfield was greatly honored and respected, and his long fight against death brought him very near to the hearts of the American people. But McKinley's kindly and homely character rendered him an object of general affection. People of every party and of every religious persuasion observed the day of his funeral with devotional and memorial services in thousands of churches, and the mourning was deep and universal.

Although Mr. Roosevelt's pledge was absolutely sincere, and although his severest critics have always admitted that he kept it, loyally, to the best of his ability, it was inevitable that the death of Mr. McKinley should make a vast change in the course of events. The two men were extraordinarily different in training and experience as well as in temperament and tastes and tendencies. The mere difference in their respective estimates of the relative importance of governmental measures would have rendered it impossible that the administration of Theodore Roosevelt should be a continuation of the administration of William McKinley. The new President certainly exercised self-repression during the ensuing three years. Yet in that time he showed enough of the quality of his mind and of the direction his activity would naturally take, if he were under no such restraint as that which he imposed on himself when taking the oath of office, to be free to act his natural self when he became the duly elected head of the nation. Quite early in the new administration there were indications of change not so much of policy as of method. The incident of the invitation to luncheon of the most eminent colored citizen of the time, Mr. Booker Washington, was an illustration. Undoubtedly Mr.

McKinley held Mr. Washington in as much esteem and honor as did Mr. Roosevelt; but it is extremely doubtful if he would have shown his esteem in a way which might and did draw down upon the President in the first month of his administration the denunciation of southerners, who are sensitive in such matters. But on the other hand, the entire cabinet of President McKinley was retained; and although changes in two departments took place not long after Mr. Roosevelt's accession, they were caused by voluntary retirement and not by political or personal differences.

The session of Congress which followed the accession of President Roosevelt was not particularly eventful. In his first message the President touched rather lightly upon the question which he was to make peculiarly his own during the ensuing seven years, that, namely, of the large corporations, popularly known as "trusts." He thought such combinations of capital should be, not prohibited but supervised and controlled, and that there should be governmental inspection of the working of great corporations engaged in interstate trade. Congress passed an act establishing a permanent Census bureau, but the bill providing for reciprocity with Cuba was defeated. This was regarded as a defeat of the President, who had urged the measure earnestly.

Directly after the assassination of President McKinley there was a general advocacy in the press, and almost universal popular support, of a movement to render less easy the commission of such crimes, and more severe the punishment of attempts to commit them. The means proposed to accomplish these ends were various. Many writers advocated the penalty of death for attempts at the life of the President or other high officers of the government. Numerous bills were introduced in Congress on the subject, but in the end no action was taken upon any of them.

The most important act of the session was that providing for the construction of the Panama Canal. It had for a long time been a question between the Nicaragua and the Panama routes. A commission of engineers reported in favor of Nicaragua, but it was hardly a secret that the chief reason for the decision was the vastly greater cost of the Panama route. It was evident that the French company would be unable to raise the funds necessary to finish the Panama Canal, but the company demanded an excessively large sum for its franchise and

for the work already done. The sum asked was \$109,000,000. Many of those interested in the general question were nevertheless strongly in favor of the Nicaragua route, not only as the cheaper but as the better location for the waterway. Chief among them was the venerable Senator Morgan, of Alabama, who had studied the subject with great care and thoroughness, was most enthusiastic in maintaining his thesis, and had made many long and able speeches in the Senate in favor of Nicaragua. In December, 1901, it was rumored that the French Company was willing largely to reduce its price, and on January 4, 1902, the directors voted to dispose of all the property of the company for forty million dollars. It had become evident to them that the United States was resolved to build a canal, and should the line across Nicaragua be chosen, the difficulty of raising money further to prosecute their own enterprise would become an impossibility. Notwithstanding the offer to sell at a lower price, the House of Representatives, on January 9, 1903, rejected an amendment in favor of Panama, by a vote of yeas 102, nays 170, and passed the Nicaragua bill. But the Senate, to the distress of Senator Morgan, substituted Panama, and the House concurred.

It seemed at the time that this action assured the realization of the dream of centuries. But there was an unexpected obstacle. The Republic of Colombia across the territory of which the canal was to be constructed was believed to be friendly, in spite of the objections and hesitations which had characterized its attitude toward the French company when the question of renewing its franchise was under consideration. Without friction or dissent in any respect from the terms proposed, a treaty was concluded between the representatives of the two republics providing for the lease of a strip of territory across the isthmus six miles in width, for a term of one hundred years, with the right of renewal; and the right was conceded to the United States to land troops to protect the canal in case Colombia should be unable to preserve order. In consideration of these concessions the United States was to pay Colombia a sum of ten million dollars outright, and an annual rental of a quarter of a million, to begin nine years after the ratification of the treaty. This agreement was made in January, 1903, and was ratified by the Senate on May 17. To the great surprise of the people and the government of the United States, there were long delays of the consideration of the treaty

by the Colombian Congress; then there were rumors that there was strong opposition to it; and ultimately the treaty was rejected by a unanimous vote. No doubt the people of that country were convinced that the United States was determined to construct the canal, and that nothing more than a determined opposition to the terms of the pending treaty would be necessary to obtain a larger sum than was offered and to restrict somewhat the granted privileges.

But the act under which the undertaking was sanctioned provided that unless a satisfactory arrangement should be made with Colombia "in a reasonable time," the alternative plan of a Nicaraguan Canal should be adopted. It was urged that the condition so described existed, and that it was the duty of the President to turn to Nicaragua. Manifestly, however, it was in the discretion of the President to determine what was a reasonable time, and he was not at all disposed to abandon the Panama route.

Probably the true history of the events which followed will never be known, so far as the agency in them of any persons connected with or acting for the government of the United States, is concerned. Immediately after the adjournment of the Congress of Colombia, on November 4, 1903, there was a rising in the City of Panama, and the independence of the State of Panama was declared. The revolution was bloodless. It is not known how many of the people were cognizant of the movement before it took place, but there was certainly no opposition to it in the State. Colombia undertook to move troops to the seat of the insurrection, but was prevented from doing so by an order from President Roosevelt directing the use of United States marines, from naval vessels stationed in Colombian waters, to oppose the use of the Panama Railroad for moving troops. An old treaty with New Grenada, the predecessor of Colombia, by which the United States undertook to guarantee the sovereignty of the republic, and to protect the free transit of the isthmus, was the excuse for this act. The opponents of the administration were not slow to point out that the treaty was used to destroy the sovereignty of the government it was designed to protect. But the order stood, the secession of Panama was accomplished, Colombia was powerless to do more than protest, and within a few days the independence of Panama was formally recognized by President Roosevelt.

It was easy to suspect that the whole movement was planned at Washington ; or at least by agents of the United States government ; or, if not so, that information of what was to occur was furnished to the government before the insurrection began. This is not the place either to present the facts on which such suspicions were founded, or to analyse those facts in defence of the acts of the administration. It may be true to say that the people of the United States were so much in earnest in favor of constructing the canal that they did not wish to know the whole truth. They would probably have said — a large majority of them — that they would justify what was done, even if it were an act of war against a weak and defenceless nation, and even if they would have considered twice before they would have acted in like manner toward a country that was capable of resisting. Ingenious theories were advanced, based on such considerations as this : that the United States proposed to undertake a great work for the welfare of all mankind, and that the fictions of sovereignty over a small strip of territory should not be allowed to be an obstacle. Another idea, somewhat akin to this, was that the United States was merely acting upon the principle of international eminent domain. None of these theories convinced or silenced those who refused to be drawn away from the fundamental principle of the equality of sovereign nations and the practice of equal and exact justice and fair dealing by all. Nevertheless the people of the United States as a whole pardoned the offence, if offence they deemed it, and there is no evidence whatever that the cause of the President exercised the remotest adverse influence upon his own political fortunes, or upon those of his party.

One phase of the affair, however, which persists on any view of the *coup* made by the United States, has never been excused by those who are sensitive as to the honor of the government. Colombia had rights in the isthmus for which the French company was willing to pay, and for which the United States agreed by treaty to pay. It lost those rights by the act of a handful of its citizens following an act of its own which was foolish and arrogant, no doubt, but was by no means unpardonable. Thereupon this government seized those rights and, a strong nation dealing with a weak one, has never given any compensation to Colombia for them, has persistently refused to submit the claim Colombia makes to arbitration, and

leaves the neighbor whom the Monroe Doctrine obliges it to protect against others, defenceless against itself. Even the right of eminent domain provides compensation for property condemned under its operation.

As soon as the new government of Panama was fully organized a treaty was made with it upon much more favorable terms than had been incorporated in the treaty with Colombia. Panama ceded in absolute sovereignty a strip across the continent ten miles wide, and consented to the sanitation of the cities of Colon and Panama by the United States. The ten millions that were to be paid to Colombia, according to the rejected treaty, were promised to Panama. The treaty was concluded in December, 1903, and was ratified by the Senate on February 23, 1904. The payment of that sum, and of the forty millions purchase money to the French Company, was skilfully effected by the Treasury Department without any disturbance of the money market; and since the transfer of the franchise and property the work of constructing the canal has proceeded without interruption from any quarter.

During the period of this administration, the government had upon its hands two important matters in its relations with foreign governments. The United States had its own difficulty with Venezuela, but at this time the old grievance was not at issue. Venezuela had contracted loans which were held in several European countries, were long outstanding, long overdue, and not only unpaid but treated by the debtor as though they did not exist. Negotiations having failed, some of the creditors resolved to take measures to enforce payment. In 1902 Great Britain, Germany, and Italy sent naval vessels to the coast of Venezuela for the purpose of enforcing their demands. The British government probably deemed unnecessary any assurance that its action would not be adverse to American interests and policy. Germany, not, of course, under suspicion, but less closely bound to America than Great Britain, gave notice in a friendly spirit of its intention to use forcible means to collect the debts owed to its citizens by Venezuela, and added to the notification this important assurance: "We declare also that under no circumstances do we consider in our proceedings the acquisition or permanent occupation of Venezuelan territory." Secretary Hay, in his reply to the communication, said: "The Monroe Doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggression by any non-American power at the expense of

any American power on American soil. It is in no wise intended as hostile to any nation in the Old World."

The British, German, and Italian ships established a "pacific blockade" of the Venezuelan coast, and captured some Venezuelan merchant vessels. Less pacific than these acts, which are ordinarily regarded as at least technically war measures, was the action of Germany in bombarding a coast town. President Castro, when he was fully convinced that the United States did not propose to protect him in his denial of justice to his creditors, yielded to the demand for a conference and an agreement to meet the obligations of his government. The conference took place, and Venezuela consented to set apart the customs duties from certain ports for the discharge of its foreign debts. A demand by the three powers which had extorted the concession that their claims should first be satisfied, was resisted by the other powers concerned, and was referred to the Hague Tribunal, which decided that the claim was just. Moreover, the Tribunal laid upon the government of the United States the duty of overseeing the settlement and of making sure that Venezuela kept its promises. In that act, it may reasonably be held, was an international recognition of the Monroe Doctrine, as there was a recognition of it by Germany when it disclaimed an intention to acquire or occupy permanently Venezuelan territory. No less than ten governments presented claims under the agreement, — in addition to the three that took aggressive action, the governments of the United States, France, Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Mexico.

The other diplomatic matter above referred to was the Alaska boundary question. The line between the United States and the British-American possessions was more or less in controversy for a hundred and twenty years after the acknowledgment of American independence, and was not finally established until the year 1903. The question as to the Alaskan boundary arose in consequence of the purchase of Russian America, and the discovery of gold in the Klondike, in disputable territory. Canada found itself shut off from access to the sea, not only by the American interpretation of the treaty under which Alaska was ceded, but by every existing map on which the boundary line was drawn. The main question was whether the line should be drawn ten leagues inland following the sinuosities of the coast, or from headland to headland. In the one case Canada would be cut off altogether from tidewater. If the line were

drawn from headland to headland Canada would gain the important Lynn canal, and would also have access to the sea by numerous bays and estuaries. It is needless to say that Canada maintained the justice of its contention as earnestly as the opposite contention was maintained in the United States, although historically and cartographically there seemed nothing to sustain a claim that had never been even suggested prior to the discovery of gold in the region. But it was a matter to be decided, and Great Britain and the United States agreed to submit it to a joint commission of three on each side. From the beginning Canada was dissatisfied with the appointment of commissioners on the part of the United States whom they regarded as biased, prejudiced, and incapable of weighing the question judicially. The British commissioners were Lord Chief Justice Alverstone and two Canadians. The commission met in London, and in November, 1903, decided the matter in accordance with the American view, except on a minor point. The majority consisted of Lord Alverstone and the three Americans. The decision gave great dissatisfaction in Canada, where the popular displeasure was about equally divided between the American commissioners, Lord Alverstone, and the British government, which was declared once more to have sacrificed Canadian interests to American arrogance and greed.

One of the most important labor struggles, important both by its magnitude and duration and on account of its political consequences, was the strike, in 1902, in the anthracite coal region of Pennsylvania. The history of the strike is long and complicated, but the details — the grievances alleged by the miners and the ultimate settlement — need not here be recited. The strike began in May, 1902, and lasted five months. It was attended with not a little violence. Both sides were firm and uncompromising. As winter was drawing on, and as a terrible scarcity of fuel was seen to be inevitable, the President determined to use his power to the utmost to bring the struggle to a close. He summoned John Mitchell, the representative of the miners, to a conference, on October 3, and a few days later appointed a commission of prominent men to inquire into the whole question, and advise terms of settlement. Meantime the miners were to return to work immediately, the strike being declared "off," and were to accept the settlement to be recommended, whatever it might be. The strike did end on October 21; the commission recommended concession of some of the

miner's demands and rejected others, and the settlement was to stand, and did stand, for three years.

Mr. Roosevelt's intervention in this labor dispute cost him the permanent loss of some of his former supporters, and brought to his support many who had previously opposed him. In some quarters his course was regarded as evidence, not merely that he was inclined to sympathize with "organized labor," even when it assumed the right to something like an equal share in the conduct of the employing business, but also that he would take actively the side of "labor" against combined "capital." It was also urged with some vehemence that his interference in the coal dispute was officious and unconstitutional. The personal opposition to him that arose from this incident was certainly more than offset by the support which he gained among those who sympathized with the coal miners; and in the community at large there was a general feeling of gratitude to him for having brought to a close a dispute which caused most serious inconvenience and financial loss through the extreme scarcity of coal and an unprecedented cost of the article. There was little or no disposition to quarrel with an act which put an end to an intolerable situation, and the argument of unconstitutionality fell on deaf ears.

Although these events of the administration have been described at some length, there is no reason to think that either or all of them had an appreciable influence upon the result of the ensuing election. On a retrospective view it seems safe to say that during the three years of Mr. Roosevelt's first administration the thoughts of leading politicians on both sides were directed — so far as they were thoughts of the election of 1904 — rather to persons than to policies.

The sentiment on the Republican side has already been suggested. Mr. Roosevelt was undeniably a popular candidate. The movement in his favor began earlier, and developed greater strength than had ever been manifested in the case of a Vice-President who had succeeded to the presidency on the death of the chosen President. Tyler, Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, — all had support in nominating conventions, but not one of them was really expected to become the candidate. So early as June, 1902, Republican State conventions in Kansas and Pennsylvania passed resolutions in favor of the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. We should probably have to go as far back as the time of General Jackson to cite similar action, so early in

an administration, in favor even of an elected President. Subsequently other State conventions urged the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt, most of them heartily, some—as in the case of New York—with obvious reluctance and with no pretence of enthusiasm. For there was opposition to him. He was accused of impulsiveness and rashness, of over-confidence in his own judgment and discernment of right and wrong; and those who held this opinion of him regarded him as “unsafe.” In secret, no doubt, there was plotting to bring forward another candidate. The person most considered as an alternative was Senator Hanna of Ohio. But it is only the truth to say that all suggestions of that sort were futile. No amount of political management could have brought about the defeat of Mr. Roosevelt. Not only an overwhelming majority of the Republican rank and file, but a great majority of the active politicians were in his favor. Many of the so-called “leaders” in both Houses of Congress were against him, but they led a pitiful minority of those who were to make the decision.

A remarkable situation developed in the Democratic party. Mr. Bryan had twice been the candidate, and twice had been defeated. He was the representative and advocate of an extreme radical policy. The conservative element had supported him half-heartedly, or refused to vote, or had gone over for the time being to the Republican candidates. Early in Mr. Roosevelt's administration the conservatives began to urge that the time had come to abandon the policies which had come into Democratic platforms by the way of Populism, and to revert to the ancient and time-honored principles of the party. Some resistance was offered to the movement, but on the whole it was successful. Some western Democratic State conventions refused to endorse the national platform of 1900; in the South there was much outspoken weariness of the dominance of Mr. Bryan in the control of the party. The East had never been particularly earnest in support of the candidate and the platforms of 1896 and 1900, and was ready to join in the movement for a “safe and sane” candidate and platform.

How to make the choice of a candidate was easily argued out. The Democrats could not succeed unless they could carry several large northern States, and their minds turned naturally to the four which had longest remained Democratic or “doubtful,”—New York, New Jersey, Indiana, and Connecticut.

They could hardly hope to win anyway unless they could have the electoral vote of New York. So they must have a candidate who, above all things, must be able to carry that State. He must have a clear record of not having bolted Mr. Bryan or any other Democratic candidate. He must nevertheless not be identified with either wing of the party. He must be a man of high standing and one who commanded general respect. Support — so far as those who took the foregoing view of what was expedient was concerned — was concentrated upon Judge Alton B. Parker of New York. Mr. Parker, after long service as a judge of the supreme court of the State, was, in 1897, elected chief judge of the Court of Appeals, for a term that would end in 1911. Personally and politically he commanded respect. He was believed to be conservative in his tendencies, but he had not been guilty of deserting his party when it followed Mr. Bryan and professed radical principles. It was therefore believed that he could have the support of both wings of the party, and that he, if any Democrat, could carry New York.

But it would give a grossly misleading view of the situation to leave the impression that the movement which eventually made Judge Parker the candidate received general acquiescence, or was not stoutly resisted. Mr. Bryan himself, who declared — and maintained his declaration — that he was not a candidate for the nomination, in a speech at Chicago, on April 23, 1904, attacked the "reorganizers," and taking for his text the platform which the Democratic State Convention had recently adopted, said, "I am sanguine to believe that I can prove to every unbiassed mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated either by the Democratic party or by any other party that stands for honesty and fair dealing in politics." In saying this he assumed what was undoubtedly true, that the platform met with Judge Parker's approval, since the convention was controlled by his friends and supporters for the nomination.

But if there was to be no reorganization, if the party was to continue to maintain the principles inseparably associated with the name and the advocacy of Mr. Bryan, who was to be the candidate? The answer introduces us to one of the strangest episodes in American political history. It is too soon after the event to narrate in detail the rise and progress in national politics of Mr. William R. Hearst. Although it is impossible

not to take note of the importance of the movement in his favor in 1904, it is equally impossible to present more than the barest outline of events without being open to an accusation of partisanship on one side or the other. Mr. Hearst was the sole owner of eight daily newspapers in five cities — New York, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. He was elected to Congress from a New York City district in 1902. Both as editor and as congressman he took extreme radical ground. In his newspapers he was a champion of the cause of labor, and an unsparing opponent of corporations and of corporate wealth. He became the president of several separate organizations of political clubs, all of which were formed to promote his fortunes as a candidate for the presidency, and his newspapers were a powerful engine to accomplish the same end. If he did not attach to himself a large number of the leaders of the Democratic party, he did gain the favor and the enthusiastic support of a vast number of the rank and file of the men who had votes. His "boom" made little show at first, for the methods employed by himself and his friends, although consummately effective, were quite unusual in political manœuvering.

Indeed, Mr. Hearst's boom was for some time treated with derision. It was only when the Democratic war horses discovered that the new comer in the field was making great progress, that he was certain to appear in the national convention with a formidable number of delegates, that they began, if not to feel alarm at the result, at least to bestir themselves to defeat him. History told them that more than one national convention had been carried off its feet by a sudden burst of personal enthusiasm, and they could not afford to take the risk of such a stampede.

The first nominating convention of the year 1904 was that of the Socialist party, which met at Chicago on Sunday, May 1, and continued in session six days. The convention consisted of 184 delegates, representing 33 States and two territories. Eight of the delegates were women. The convention was remarkable for the number of editors of socialist journals and periodicals who were members. More than half of all the newspapers of the country engaged in the propagation of socialist principles were represented by members of their staffs. James F. Carey, of Massachusetts, was the temporary chairman of

the convention. There was no permanent president, but the convention chose a chairman for the day at the opening of each session.

The business transacted was much more extensive in amount and scope than that of ordinary national nominating conventions. In addition to the platform of principles the convention adopted a constitution for the party, after a detailed discussion, clause by clause. It also presented separate "programs" of State and municipal reforms, and passed many resolutions expressing the opinion of the members on events of the day — the Japanese war, occurrences in Colorado, and the like. The debates upon all these matters were conducted in a manner — be it said without offence — characteristic of the free spoken, sometimes even violent, methods of Socialists. Several of the verbal encounters between speakers and the chair were decidedly unparliamentary, judged by ordinary standards.

It was well that the convention had so much business to occupy it, for it was not until the afternoon of the fifth day that the platform was ready to be reported. It was known from the beginning that the sentiment of the convention was divided on two subjects. There was a radical faction which desired to put into the platform a declaration concerning marriage, and the dissolubility of the marital relation which was strongly opposed by the more conservative delegates. The chairman of the committee was an extreme radical on this question. There was another division on the subject of the relation of socialism and the Socialist party to trade unions. One faction wished to effect an alliance between the party and the organizations representing labor; the other faction maintained that the trade unionists were endeavoring to effect merely a single reform in their own interest, and that they should receive political assistance only on condition of their joining the Socialist party. As will be seen the platform adopted makes no reference whatever to the marriage relation; on the trade union question the convention both in independent resolutions, and in the platform, followed a course of compromise, strongly approving the demands of labor and urging all members of the "worker class" to become Socialists. The platform, which follows, was unanimously adopted.

1. The Socialist party, in convention assembled, makes its appeal to the American people as the defender and preserver of the idea of liberty and self-government, in which the nation was born; as

the only political movement standing for the program and principles by which the liberty of the individual may become a fact ; as the only political organization that is democratic, and that has for its purpose the democratizing of the whole of society.

To this idea of liberty the Republican and Democratic parties are equally false. They alike struggle for power to maintain and profit by an industrial system which can be preserved only by the complete overthrow of such liberties as we already have, and by the still further enslavement and degradation of labor.

Our American institutions came into the world in the name of freedom. They have been seized upon by the capitalist class as the means of rooting out the idea of freedom from among the people. Our state and national legislatures have become the mere agencies of great propertied interests. These interests control the appointments and decisions of the judges of our courts. They have come into what is practically a private ownership of all the functions and forces of government. They are using these to betray and conquer foreign and weaker peoples, in order to establish new markets for the surplus goods which the people make, but are too poor to buy. They are gradually so invading and restricting the right of suffrage as to take away unawares the right of the worker to a vote or voice in public affairs. By enacting new and misinterpreting old laws, they are preparing to attack the liberty of the individual even to speak or think for himself, or for the common good.

By controlling all the sources of social revenue, the possessing class is able to silence what might be the voice of protest against the passing of liberty and the coming of tyranny. It completely controls the university and public school, the pulpit and the press, and the arts and literatures. By making these economically dependent upon itself, it has brought all the forms of public teaching into servile submission to its own interests.

Our political institutions are also being used as the destroyers of that individual property upon which all liberty and opportunity depend. The promise of economic independence to each man was one of the faiths upon which our institutions were founded. But, under the guise of defending private property, capitalism is using our political institutions to make it impossible for the vast majority of human beings ever to become possessors of private property in the means of life.

Capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property. Its development is through the legalized confiscation of all that the labor of the working class produces, above its subsistence-wage. The private ownership of the means of employment grounds society in an economic slavery which renders intellectual and political tyranny inevitable.

Socialism comes so to organize industry and society that every individual shall be secure in that private property in the means of life upon which his liberty of being, thought and action depend. It comes to rescue the people from the fast increasing and successful assault of capitalism upon the liberty of the individual.

2. As an American socialist party, we pledge our fidelity to the principles of international socialism, as embodied in the united thought and action of the socialists of all nations. In the industrial development already accomplished, the interests of the world's workers are separated by no national boundaries. The condition of the most exploited and oppressed workers, in the most remote places of the earth, inevitably tends to drag down all the workers of the world to the same level. The tendency of the competitive wage system is to make labor's lowest condition the measure or rule of its universal condition. Industry and finance are no longer national but international, in both organization and results. The chief significance of national boundaries, and of the so-called patriotisms which the ruling class of each nation is seeking to revive, is the power which these give to capitalism to keep the workers of the world from uniting, and to throw them against each other in the struggles of contending capitalist interests for the control of the yet unexploited markets of the world, or the remaining sources of profit.

The socialist movement, therefore, is a world-movement. It knows of no conflicts of interests between the workers of one nation and the workers of another. It stands for the freedom of the workers of all nations ; and, in so standing, it makes for the full freedom of all humanity.

3. The socialist movement owes its birth and growth to that economic development or world-process which is rapidly separating a working or producing class from a possessing or capitalist class. The class that produces nothing possesses labor's fruits, and the opportunities and enjoyments these fruits afford, while the class that does the world's real work has increasing economic uncertainty, and physical and intellectual misery, for its portion.

The fact that these two classes have not yet become fully conscious of their distinction from each other, the fact that the lines of division and interest may not yet be clearly drawn, does not change the fact of the class conflict.

This class struggle is due to the private ownership of the means of employment, or the tools of production. Wherever and whenever man owned his own land and tools, and by them produced only the things which he used, economic independence was possible. But production, or the making of goods, has long ceased to be individual. The labor of scores, or even thousands, enters into

almost every article produced. Production is now social or collective. Practically everything is made or done by many men — sometimes separated by seas or continents — working together for the same end. But this coöperation in production is not for the direct use of the things made by the workers who make them, but for the profit of the owners of the tools and means of production; and to this is due the present division of society into two classes; and from it have sprung all the miseries, inharmonies and contradictions of our civilization.

Between these two classes there can be no possible compromise or identity of interest, any more than there can be peace in the midst of war, or light in the midst of darkness. A society based upon this class division carries in itself the seeds of its own destruction. Such a society is founded in fundamental injustice. There can be no possible basis for social peace, for individual freedom, for mental and moral harmony, except in the conscious and complete triumph of the working class as the only class that has the right or power to be.

4. The socialist program is not a theory imposed upon society for its acceptance or rejection. It is but the interpretation of what is, sooner or later, inevitable. Capitalism is already struggling to its destruction. It is no longer competent to organize or administer the work of the world, or even to preserve itself. The captains of industry are appalled at their own inability to control or direct the rapidly socializing forces of industry. The so-called trust is but a sign and form of the developing socialization of the world's work. The universal increase of the uncertainty of employment, the universal capitalist determination to break down the unity of labor in the trades unions, the widespread apprehensions of impending change, reveal that the institutions of capitalist society are passing under the power of inhering forces that will soon destroy them.

Into the midst of the strain and crisis of civilization, the socialist movement comes as the only conservative force. If the world is to be saved from chaos, from universal disorder and misery, it must be by the union of the workers of all nations in the socialist movement. The socialist party comes with the only proposition or program for intelligently and deliberately organizing the nation for the common good of all its citizens. It is the first time that the mind of man has ever been directed toward the conscious organization of society.

Socialism means that all those things upon which the people in common depend shall by the people in common be owned and administered. It means that the tools of employment shall belong to their creators and users; that all production shall be for the

direct use of the producers; that the making of goods for profit shall come to an end; that we shall all be workers together; and that all opportunities shall be open and equal to all men.

5. To the end that the workers may seize every possible advantage that may strengthen them to gain complete control of the powers of government, and thereby the sooner establish the coöperative commonwealth, the Socialist Party pledges itself to watch and work, in both the economic and the political struggle, for each successive immediate interest of the working class; for shortened days of labor and increases of wages; for the insurance of the workers against accident, sickness and lack of employment; for pensions for aged and exhausted workers; for the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange; for the graduated taxation of incomes, inheritances, franchises and land values, the proceeds to be applied to the public employment and improvement of the conditions of the workers; for the complete education of children, and their freedom from the workshop; for the prevention of the use of the military against labor in the settlement of strikes; for the free administration of justice; for popular government, including initiative, referendum, proportional representation, equal suffrage of men and women, municipal home rule, and the recall of officers by their constituents; and for every gain or advantage for the workers that may be wrested from the capitalist system, and that may relieve the suffering and strengthen the hands of labor. We lay upon every man elected to any executive or legislative office the first duty of striving to procure whatever is for the workers' most immediate interest, and for whatever will lessen the economic and political powers of the capitalist, and increase the like powers of the worker.

But, in so doing, we are using these remedial measures as means to the one great end of the coöperative commonwealth. Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry, and thus come into their rightful inheritance.

To this end we pledge ourselves, as the party of the working class, to use all political power, as fast as it shall be entrusted to us by our fellow-workers, both for their immediate interests and for their ultimate and complete emancipation. To this end we appeal to all the workers of America, and to all who will lend their lives to the service of the workers in their struggle to gain their own, and to all who will nobly and disinterestedly give their days and energies unto the workers' cause, to cast in their lot and faith with the socialist party. Our appeal for the trust and suffrages

of our fellow-workers is at once an appeal for their common good and freedom, and for the freedom and blossoming of our common humanity. In pledging ourselves, and those we represent, to be faithful to the appeal which we make, we believe that we are but preparing the soil of that economic freedom from which will spring the freedom of the whole man.

It was clear from all the proceedings of the convention that the members regarded the platform as of much greater importance than the nominations. In fact, there was at no time any doubt as to the candidates. Immediately after the adoption of the platform, on May 5, Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana, was nominated by acclamation as the candidate for President, and Benjamin Hanford, of New York, was, also by acclamation, named for Vice-President. The convention remained in session another day to finish its business.

The United Christian party has for many years held an annual convention, the members of which are not in a strict sense delegates. The meeting in 1904 was not reported in any public journal, and it was not possible, even if it were important, to ascertain how many persons attended, nor the nature of the proceedings, except the declaration of principles, which is appended. It was determined not to make any nominations, but to devote the energies of those present to a dissemination of the views of the party, which were announced as follows : —

We, the United Christian party, in national mass convention assembled, in His name, in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, May 2, 1904, acknowledging Almighty God as our Father and Jesus Christ as our leader, commander, governor and king; believing that the time has now come when all Christians and patriots should unite on the day of election and vote direct on all questions of vital importance, and apply Christian golden rule to all government by and for the people, do hereby declare that the platform and purpose of the United Christian party is and shall be to work and stand for union in His name, according to the Lord's Prayer, for the fulfillment of God's law through direct legislation of the people governed by the golden rule, regardless of sex, creed, color, nationality.

As an expression of consent or allegiance on the part of the governed, in harmony with the above statements —

We also declare in favor of direct legislation providing for an equal standard of morals for both sexes, and most vigorously oppose the traffic in girls and all forms of the social evil.

We are opposed to war and condemn mob violence.

We favor government ownership of coal mines, oil wells and public utilities.

We are opposed to government revenue from the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor as a beverage.

We are opposed to all trusts and combines contrary to the welfare of the common people, and declare that Christian government through direct legislation will regulate the trusts and labor problem according to the golden rule.

The convention of the Republican party, held at Chicago on June 21-23, was uneventful. There was no contest over either the platform or the candidates. It was known in advance that Mr. Roosevelt would be nominated for reelection with complete unanimity ; and as soon as the consent of Mr. Fairbanks was obtained to take the second place on the ticket there was no suggestion that any other person would be proposed. Elihu Root, of New York, was the temporary chairman and Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, was the permanent president of the convention. Each of the presiding officers made long and elaborate addresses, which their eminence in the public service, their ability and their standing in the party combined to render important features of the convention proceedings. On the second day the following platform was reported and unanimously adopted : —

Fifty years ago the Republican party came into existence, dedicated, among other purposes, to the great task of arresting the extension of human slavery. In 1860 it elected its first President. During twenty-four years of the forty-four which have elapsed since the election of Lincoln the Republican party has held complete control of the government. For eighteen more of the forty-four years it has held partial control through the possession of one or two branches of the government, while the Democratic party during the same period has had complete control for only two years. This long tenure of power by the Republican party is not due to chance. It is a demonstration that the Republican party has commanded the confidence of the American people for nearly two generations to a degree never equalled in our history, and has displayed a high capacity for rule and government which has been made even more conspicuous by the incapacity and infirmity of purpose shown by its opponents.

The Republican party entered upon its present period of complete supremacy in 1897. We have every right to congratulate ourselves upon the work since then accomplished, for it has added lustre even to the traditions of the party which carried the Gov-

ernment through the storms of civil war. We then found the country, after four years of Democratic rule, in evil plight, oppressed with misfortune, and doubtful of the future. Public credit had been lowered, the revenues were declining, the debt was growing, the Administration's attitude toward Spain was feeble and mortifying, the standard of values was threatened and uncertain, labor was unemployed, business was sunk in the depression which had succeeded the panic of 1893, hope was faint, and confidence was gone.

We met these unhappy conditions vigorously, effectively and at once. We replaced a Democratic tariff law based on free-trade principles and garnished with sectional protection by a consistent protective tariff, and industry, freed from suppression and stimulated by the encouragement of wise laws, has expanded to a degree never before known, has conquered new markets and has created a volume of exports which has surpassed imagination. Under the Dingley Tariff labor has been fully employed, wages have risen and all industries have revived and prospered.

We firmly established the gold standard, which was then menaced with destruction. Confidence returned to business, and with confidence an unexampled prosperity. For deficient revenues supplemented by improvident issues of bonds we gave the country an income which produced a large surplus, and which enabled us only four years after the Spanish War had closed to remove over one hundred millions of annual war taxes, reduce the public debt and lower the interest charges of the Government. The public credit, which had been so lowered that in time of peace a Democratic administration made large loans at extravagant rates of interest in order to pay current expenditures, rose under Republican administration to its highest point, and enabled us to borrow at 2 per cent., even in time of war.

We refused to palter longer with the miseries of Cuba. We fought a quick and victorious war with Spain. We set Cuba free, governed the island for three years, and then gave it to the Cuban people with order restored, with ample revenues, with education and public health established, free from debt, and connected with the United States by wise provisions for our mutual interests.

We have organized the government of Porto Rico, and its people now enjoy peace, freedom, order and prosperity.

In the Philippines we have suppressed insurrection, established order, and given to life and property a security never known there before. We have organized civil government, made it effective and strong in administration, and have conferred upon the people of those islands the largest civil liberty they have ever enjoyed. By our possession of the Philippines we were enabled to take prompt

and effective action in the relief of the legations at Peking, and a decisive part in preventing the partition and preserving the integrity of China.

The possession of a route for an Isthmian canal, so long the dream of American statesmanship, is now an accomplished fact. The great work of connecting the Pacific and Atlantic by a canal is at last begun, and it is due to the Republican party.

We have passed laws which will bring the arid lands of the United States within the area of cultivation.

We have reorganized the army and put it in the highest state of efficiency.

We have passed laws for the improvement and support of the militia.

We have pushed forward the building of the navy, the defence and protection of our honor and our interests.

Our administration of the great departments of the Government has been honest and efficient, and wherever wrongdoing has been discovered the Republican administration has not hesitated to probe the evil and bring offenders to justice without regard to party or political ties.

Laws enacted by the Republican party which the Democratic party failed to enforce, and which were intended for the protection of the public against the unjust discrimination or the illegal encroachment of vast aggregations of capital, have been fearlessly enforced by a Republican President, and new laws insuring reasonable publicity as to the operations of great corporations and providing additional remedies for the prevention of discrimination in freight rates have been passed by a Republican Congress.

In this record of achievement during the past eight years may be read the pledges which the Republican party has fulfilled. We promise to continue these policies and we declare our constant adherence to the following principles:

Protection which guards and develops our industries is a cardinal policy of the Republican party. The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection, and therefore rates of duty should be re-adjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration, but this work cannot safely be committed to any other hands than those of the Republican party. To intrust it to the Democratic party is to invite disaster. Whether, as in 1892, the Democratic party declares the protective tariff unconstitutional, or whether it demands tariff reform or tariff revision, its real object is always the destruction of the protective system. However specious the name, the purpose is ever the

same. A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity. To a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can be safely intrusted. When the only free-trade country among the great nations agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it.

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection, and without injury to American agriculture, American labor or any American industry.

We believe it to be the duty of the Republican party to uphold the gold standard and the integrity and value of our national currency. The maintenance of the gold standard, established by the Republican party, cannot safely be committed to the Democratic party, which resisted its adoption, and has never given any proof since that time of belief in it or fidelity to it.

While every other industry has prospered under the fostering aid of Republican legislation, American shipping engaged in foreign trade, in competition with the low cost of construction, low wages and heavy subsidies of foreign governments, has not for many years received from the Government of the United States adequate encouragement of any kind. We therefore favor legislation which will encourage and build up the American merchant marine, and we cordially approve the legislation of the last Congress, which created the Merchant Marine Commission to investigate and report upon this subject.

A navy powerful enough to defend the United States against any attack, to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, and to watch over our commerce, is essential to the safety and the welfare of the American people. To maintain such a navy is the fixed policy of the Republican party.

We cordially approve the attitude of President Roosevelt and Congress in regard to the exclusion of Chinese labor and promise a continuance of the Republican policy in that direction.

The Civil Service Law was placed on the statute books by the Republican party, which has always sustained it, and we renew our former declarations that it shall be thoroughly and honestly enforced.

We are always mindful of the country's debt to the soldiers and sailors of the United States, and we believe in making ample provision for them, and in the liberal administration of the pension laws.

We favor the peaceful settlement of international differences by arbitration.

We commend the vigorous efforts made by the Administration to protect American citizens in foreign lands and pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and equal protection of all our citizens abroad. It is the unquestioned duty of the Government to procure for all our citizens, without distinction, the rights of travel and sojourn in friendly countries, and we declare ourselves in favor of all proper efforts tending to that end.

Our great interests and our growing commerce in the Orient render the condition of China of high importance to the United States. We cordially commend the policy pursued in that direction by the Administrations of President McKinley and President Roosevelt.

We favor such Congressional action as shall determine whether by special discriminations the elective franchise in any State has been unconstitutionally limited, and if such is the case, we demand that representation in Congress and in the Electoral College shall be proportionately reduced as directed by the Constitution of the United States.

Combinations of capital and of labor are the results of the economic movement of the age, but neither must be permitted to infringe upon the rights and interests of the people. Such combinations, when lawfully formed for lawful purposes, are alike entitled to the protection of the laws, but both are subject to the laws, and neither can be permitted to break them.

The great statesman and patriotic American, William McKinley, who was reelected by the Republican party to the Presidency four years ago, was assassinated just at the threshold of his second term. The entire nation mourned his untimely death, and did that justice to his great qualities of mind and character which history will confirm and repeat.

The American people were fortunate in his successor, to whom they turned with a trust and confidence which have been fully justified. President Roosevelt brought to the great responsibilities thus sadly forced upon him a clear head, a brave heart, an earnest patriotism and high ideals of public duty and public service. True to the principles of the Republican party and to the policies which that party had declared, he has also shown himself ready for every emergency and has met new and vital questions with ability and with success.

The confidence of the people in his justice, inspired by his public career, enabled him to render personally an inestimable service to the country by bringing about a settlement of the coal strike, which threatened such disastrous results at the opening of Winter in 1902.

Our foreign policy under his administration has not only been

able, vigorous and dignified, but in the highest degree successful. The complicated questions which arose in Venezuela were settled in such a way by President Roosevelt that the Monroe Doctrine was signally vindicated, and the cause of peace and arbitration greatly advanced.

His prompt and vigorous action in Panama, which we commend in the highest terms, not only secured to us the canal route but avoided foreign complications which might have been of a very serious character.

He has continued the policy of President McKinley in the Orient and our position in China, signalized by our recent commercial treaty with that empire, has never been so high.

He secured the tribunal by which the vexed and perilous question of the Alaskan boundary was finally settled.

Whenever crimes against humanity have been perpetrated which have shocked our people, his protest has been made and our good offices have been tendered, but always with due regard to international obligations.

Under his guidance we find ourselves at peace with all the world, and never were we more respected or our wishes more regarded by foreign nations.

Preëminently successful in regard to our foreign relations, he has been equally fortunate in dealing with domestic questions. The country has known that the public credit and the national currency were absolutely safe in the hands of his Administration. In the enforcement of the laws he has shown not only courage, but the wisdom which understands that to permit laws to be violated or disregarded opens the door to anarchy, while the just enforcement of the law is the soundest conservatism. He has held firmly to the fundamental American doctrine that all men must obey the law; that there must be no distinction between rich and poor, between strong and weak; but that justice and equal protection under the law must be secured to every citizen without regard to race, creed or condition.

His administration has been throughout vigorous and honorable, high-minded and patriotic. We commend it without reservation to the considerate judgment of the American people.

On June 23, Theodore Roosevelt, of New York, was nominated as the candidate for President by a unanimous *viva voce* vote of the 994 delegates of the convention. Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana, was nominated by acclamation as the candidate for Vice-President.

The Prohibition party held its convention at Indianapolis on June 29. There were 704 delegates in attendance, of whom

about 60 were women. Most of the States were represented in whole or in part,—all but three, North Carolina, South Carolina and Louisiana, according to one account; according to another, there were no delegates present from Montana or Utah. Homer L. Castle, of Pennsylvania, was the temporary chairman, and A. G. Wolfenbarger, of Nebraska, the permanent president of the convention. The committee on resolutions had great difficulty in coming to an agreement on the platform. It will be seen that those who urged that special, almost exclusive, stress should be laid upon the importance of prohibition won a victory over those who favored a more general platform, similar to those in some earlier canvasses. But the platform was generally approved, and was ultimately adopted by a unanimous vote, as follows : —

The Prohibition party, in national convention assembled, at Indianapolis, June 30, 1904, recognizing that the chief end of all government is the establishment of those principles of righteousness and justice which have been revealed to men as the will of the ever-living God, desiring His blessing upon our national life, and believing in the perpetuation of the high ideals of government of the people, by the people and for the people, established by our fathers, makes the following declaration of principles and purposes :

The widely prevailing system of the licensed and legalized sale of alcoholic beverages is so ruinous to individual interests, so inimical to public welfare, so destructive of national wealth and so subversive of the rights of great masses of our citizenship, that the destruction of the traffic is, and for years has been, the most important question in American politics.

We denounce the lack of statesmanship exhibited by the leaders of the Democratic and Republican parties in their refusal to recognize the paramount importance of this question, and the cowardice with which the leaders of these parties have courted the favor of those whose selfish interests are advanced by the continuation and augmentation of the traffic, until to-day the influence of the liquor traffic practically dominates national, State and local government throughout the nation.

We declare the truth, demonstrated by the experience of half a century, that all methods of dealing with the liquor traffic which recognize its right to exist, in any form, under any system of license or tax or regulation, have proved powerless to remove its evils, and useless as checks upon its growth, while the insignificant public revenues which have accrued therefrom have seared the public conscience against a recognition of its iniquity.

We call public attention to the fact, proved by the experience of more than fifty years, that to secure the enactment and enforcement of prohibitory legislation, in which alone lies the hope of the protection of the people from the liquor traffic, it is necessary that the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government should be in the hands of a political party in harmony with the prohibition principle, and pledged to its embodiment in law, and to the execution of those laws.

We pledge the Prohibition party, wherever given power by the suffrages of the people, to the enactment and enforcement of laws prohibiting and abolishing the manufacture, importation, transportation and sale of alcoholic beverages.

We declare that there is not only no other issue of equal importance before the American people to-day, but that the so-called issues upon which the Democratic and Republican parties seek to divide the electorate of the country are, in large part, subterfuges under the cover of which they wrangle for the spoils of office.

Recognizing that the intelligent voters of the country may properly ask our attitude upon other questions of public concern, we declare ourselves in favor of:

The impartial enforcement of all law.

The safeguarding of the people's rights by a rigid application of the principles of justice to all combinations and organizations of capital and labor.

The recognition of the fact that the right of suffrage should depend upon the mental and moral qualifications of the citizen.

A more intimate relation between the people and government, by a wise application of the principle of the initiative and referendum.

Such changes in our laws as will place tariff schedules in the hands of an omnipartisan commission.

The application of uniform laws to all our country and dependencies.

The election of United States Senators by vote of the people.

The extension and honest administration of the civil service laws.

The safeguarding of every citizen in every place under the government of the people of the United States, in all the rights guaranteed by the laws and the Constitution.

International arbitration, and we declare that our nation should contribute, in every manner consistent with national dignity, to the permanent establishment of peace between all nations.

The reform of our divorce laws, the final extirpation of polygamy, and the total overthrow of the present shameful system of

the illegal sanction of the social evil, with its unspeakable traffic in girls, by the municipal authorities of almost all our cities.

When the convention met there was a strong, but by no means unanimous, sentiment in favor of the nomination of General Nelson A. Miles for President. It was opposed on the ground that General Miles had never declared himself to be a Prohibitionist. It was discouraged by the general himself, who, knowing what was proposed, urged, in a letter to Mr. John G. Woolley, of Chicago, that action by the convention should be postponed until after the nominations by the Republican and Democratic parties should have been made. Some of his suggestions in the same letter as to the proper policy for the Prohibition party to adopt, were not well received. As the suggestions were not followed in the platform, General Miles sent a telegram positively declining to accept the nomination. The Miles candidacy had caused a somewhat angry factional controversy, which ended suddenly upon the receipt of the general's telegram, and Silas C. Swallow, of Pennsylvania, was then nominated for President by acclamation. There was but one vote by the convention, for Vice-President. George W. Carroll, of Texas, received 626 votes, to 132 for Isaiah H. Amos, of Oregon. The fact that the total number was greater than the number of delegates, has the usual explanation, that the delegates present from a State cast the whole number of votes to which the State was entitled.

The Socialist-Labor party held its convention in New York City on July 2 and the six following days. Forty-one delegates, representing eighteen States, composed the convention. Mr. William W. Cox, of Illinois, was the temporary Chairman. Under the permanent organization there was a different Chairman and vice-chairman on each day. There seem to have been long but not by any means angry debates upon a great variety of matters. The platform, which was reported late on July 3, was discussed, paragraph by paragraph, the next day, and finally adopted in the form given it by the Committee on Resolutions, as follows : —

The Socialist Labor party of America, in convention assembled, reasserts the inalienable right of man to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We hold that the purpose of government is to secure to every citizen the enjoyment of this right : but taught by experience we

hold furthermore that such right is illusory to the majority of the people, to wit, the working class, under the present system of economic inequality that is essentially destructive of their life, their liberty and their happiness.

We hold that the true theory of politics is that the machinery of government must be controlled by the whole people; but again taught by experience we hold furthermore that the true theory of economics is that the means of production must likewise be owned, operated and controlled by the people in common. Man cannot exercise his right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness without the ownership of the land on and the tool with which to work. Deprived of these, his life, his liberty and his fate fall into the hands of the class that owns those essentials for work and production.

We hold that the existing contradiction between the theory of democratic government and the fact of a despotic economic system — the private ownership of the natural and social opportunities — divides the people into two classes, the capitalist class and the working class; throws society into the convulsions of the class struggle, and perverts government to the exclusive benefit of the capitalist class.

Thus labor is robbed of the wealth which it alone produces, is denied the means of self-employment, and, by compulsory idleness in wage slavery, is even deprived of the necessities of life.

Against such a system the Socialist Labor party raises the banner of revolt, and demands the unconditional surrender of the capitalist class.

The time is fast coming when, in the natural course of social evolution, this system, through the destructive action of its failures and crises on the one hand, and the constructive tendencies of its trusts and other capitalist combinations on the other hand, will have worked out its own downfall.

We, therefore, call upon the wage workers of America to organize under the banner of the Socialist Labor party into a class-conscious body, aware of its rights and determined to conquer them.

And we also call upon all other intelligent citizens to place themselves squarely upon the ground of working class interests, and join us in this mighty and noble work of human emancipation, so that we may put summary end to the existing barbarous class conflict by placing the land and all the means of production, transportation and distribution into the hands of the people as a collective body, and substituting the coöperative commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war and social disorder — a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization.

On July 6 the convention nominated for President of the United States Charles H. Corregan, of New York; for Vice-President, William W. Cox, of Illinois. It remained in session two days longer amending the constitution of the party and discussing the attitude which should be taken toward trade-unionism, — a subject which — as has been noted — occupied the attention of the rival Socialist party. The views of the Socialist-Labor party may fairly be inferred from a single paragraph of its pronouncement on the topic: "So far from drilling the working class in the theoretic understanding of its interests, Gompers unionism befogs the workingman's intellect with capitalistic economics, and it hounds Socialist or working class economics out of its camp, under the false pretence that such economic teachings are 'politics,' and that they 'divide the working class.'"

The Populist party held its convention at Springfield, Illinois, on July 4 and 5. The date seems to have been fixed to signify the intention of those who controlled the organization to have nothing to do with the Democratic party in the approaching canvass. They saw, as the whole country saw, that the Democrats were about to rid themselves, for that occasion at least, of what a prominent member of the party referred to as "the taint of populism." Consequently the Populists who had not already joined the Democratic party were practically all of the "middle-of-the-road" faction. Only once in the convention was the suggestion made that it might be well to postpone action until it should be seen whether the Hearst partisans were not a majority of the Democratic delegates. But even that proposition was shouted down with cries — "No, no; get into the Democratic party, where you belong." There was no hope of an alliance with that party.

"About three hundred" delegates are said to have constituted the Populist convention. Twenty-four States and two territories were represented on the general committees. That most of the members were residents in States of the central west is evident from the fact that the same person was appointed a member of all four committees from each of the States of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Wisconsin, South Dakota, and Washington — in all probability because there was but one representative from each of those States. Pennsylvania had apparently two delegates in

attendance. The one member from Massachusetts was the only New England man in the convention. L. H. Weller, of Iowa, was the temporary chairman, and J. M. Mallett, of Texas, the permanent President. The committee on resolutions held two protracted sessions, the first lasting until three o'clock in the morning of July 5, and the second nearly the whole of that day from early forenoon until late afternoon. The platform, when it was ready, was received with great applause and was unanimously adopted as follows: —

The People's party reaffirms its adherence to the basic truths of the Omaha platform of 1892, and of the subsequent platforms of 1896 and 1900. In session in its fourth national convention on July 4, 1904, in the city of Springfield, Ill., it draws inspiration from the day that saw the birth of the nation as well as its own birth as a party, and also from the soul of him who lived at its present place of meeting. We renew our allegiance to the old-fashioned American spirit that gave this nation existence, and made it distinctive among the peoples of the earth. We again sound the key-note of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal in a political sense, which was the sense in which that instrument, being a political document, intended that the utterance should be understood. We assert that the departure from this fundamental truth is responsible for the ills from which we suffer as a nation, that the giving of special privileges to the few has enabled them to dominate the many, thereby tending to destroy the political equality which is the corner-stone of democratic government.

Holding fast to the truths of the fathers we vigorously protest against the spirit of mammonism and of thinly veiled monarchy that is invading certain sections of our national life, and of the very administration itself. This is a nation of peace, and we deplore the appeal to the spirit of force and militarism which is shown in ill-advised and vainglorious boasting and in more harmful ways in the denial of the rights of man under martial law.

A political democracy and an industrial despotism cannot exist side by side; and nowhere is this truth more plainly shown than in the gigantic transportation monopolies which have bred all sorts of kindred trusts, subverted the governments of many of the States, or established their official agents in the National Government. We submit that it is better for the Government to own the railroads than for the railroads to own the Government, and that one or the other alternative seems inevitable.

We call the attention of our fellow-citizens to the fact that the

surrender of both of the old parties to corporative influences leaves the People's party the only party of reform in the nation.

Therefore we submit the following platform of principles to the American people: —

The issuing of money is a function of government, and should never be delegated to corporations or individuals. The Constitution gives to Congress alone power to issue money and regulate its value.

We therefore demand that all money shall be issued by the Government in such quantity as shall maintain a stability in prices, every dollar to be full legal tender, none of which shall be a debt redeemable in other money.

We demand that postal savings banks be established by the Government for the safe deposit of the savings of the people.

We believe in the right of labor to organize for the benefit and protection of those who toil; and pledge the efforts of the People's party to preserve this right inviolate. Capital is organized and has no right to deny to labor the privilege which it claims for itself. We feel that intelligent organization of labor is essential; that it raises the standard of workmanship; promotes the efficiency, intelligence, independence and character of the wage earner. We believe with Abraham Lincoln that labor is prior to capital, and is not its slave, but its companion, and we plead for that broad spirit of toleration and justice which will promote industrial peace through the observance of the principles of voluntary arbitration.

We favor the enactment of legislation looking to the improvement of conditions for wage earners, the abolition of child labor, the suppression of sweat shops, and of convict labor in competition with free labor, and the exclusion from American shores of foreign pauper labor.

We favor the shorter work day, and declare that if eight hours constitute a day's labor in Government service, that eight hours should constitute a day's labor in factories, workshops and mines.

As a means of placing all public questions directly under the control of the people, we demand that legal provision be made under which the people may exercise the initiative, referendum and proportional representation and direct vote for all public officers with the right of recall.

Land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is a heritage of all the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes, and alien ownership of land should be prohibited.

We demand a return to the original interpretation of the Constitution and a fair and impartial enforcement of laws under it, and denounce government by injunction and imprisonment without the right of trial by jury.

To prevent unjust discrimination and monopoly the Government should own and control the railroads, and those public utilities which in their nature are monopolies. To perfect the postal service, the Government should own and operate the general telegraph and telephone systems and provide a parcels post.

As to these trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies, we demand that those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enables them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn. Corporations being the creatures of government should be subjected to such governmental regulations and control as will adequately protect the public. We demand the taxation of monopoly privileges, while they remain in private hands, to the extent of the value of the privileges granted.

We demand that Congress shall enact a general law uniformly regulating the power and duties of all incorporated companies doing interstate business.

Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, who was Bryan's "running mate" on the Populist ticket, in 1896, was nominated for President, and Thomas H. Tibbles, of Nebraska, was the candidate for Vice-President.

St. Louis
The national convention of the Democratic party was held at Chicago on July 6 and the following days. The situation prior to the opening of the convention appeared to be chaotic, but appearances were deceitful. In fact the issue was at no time in doubt. The earnest opposition of Mr. Bryan to the nomination of Judge Parker has already been mentioned. He did not cease from that opposition. In a letter written a month before the convention, dated June 9, and immediately published, he wrote, among other things, "it is the first time, in recent years at least, that a man has been urged to so high a position on the ground that his opinions are unknown." On the 20th of June he made a speech to a great gathering in New York City, in which he attacked the candidacy of Judge Parker most vehemently, and in a graphic and eloquent manner enumerated the issues of the time on which the opinions of Mr. Parker had not been announced, — coinage, imperialism, tariff, the trusts, and other live political topics. If he did not express his hope in so many words he allowed the "interviewers" of the press who thronged about him to understand that his policy would be to persuade the convention to frame such a platform that Judge Parker would refuse to stand on it. The opposition of Tammany Hall to Parker was open and pronounced. Whether that organization, with a prospect of suc-

cess before it, would have favored the nomination of Mr. Hearst, is purely a matter of conjecture. At all events the ostensible purpose of Tammany was to urge the selection of Mayor George B. McClellan.

Nor was this the only opposition — outspoken or secret — that the movement against Parker encountered. The friends of Senator Gorman, of Maryland, who undoubtedly sympathized with the movement to eliminate radicalism from the party, endeavored with little success to promote his candidacy. The proceedings in the selection of delegates in Illinois were little short of riotous, and led to a contest for the seats which was carried into the convention and decided by a roll-call vote. In several of the States propositions to endorse the candidacy of Judge Parker were decisively defeated.

In spite of all this the friends of Parker were confident. The canvass in his favor was in the expert hands of Governor David B. Hill, whose leadership and control were plainly evident to observers of the events just preceding the opening of the session. Those who had drawn "planks" for the platform consulted him, and were hopeful or disappointed according to his treatment of them. Although hardly more than a third of the delegates were "instructed" for Parker, he assured all comers that the nomination of his candidate was certain.

John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, was the temporary chairman, and Champ Clark, of Missouri, the permanent president of the convention. The first important business was to determine the right of delegates to seats. The committee on credentials reported in favor of the Parker delegates from the contested districts of Illinois. There was a minority report, in favor of the Hearst delegates, and Mr. Bryan argued at length in support of their rights. He was received with general and enthusiastic applause when he entered the convention and began his speech; but when the question was put to vote he was defeated by 299 to 647. That was the first test vote in the convention and it indicated the ultimate result. More than two-thirds of the convention was against Mr. Bryan. The decision was of no practical importance, as the Illinois State Convention had directed the delegation to cast its vote as a unit for Mr. Hearst, and its vote was so given. But the test vote indicated clearly the temper of the convention.

There was an almost unprecedented struggle in the framing of the platform by the Committee on Resolutions. Indeed that

committee was a most remarkable one in the political prominence of a large number of its members. Besides Governor Hill and Mr. Bryan, the membership included Senators Bailey, Carmack, Daniel, Dubois, Newlands, and Tillman, ex-Senators H. G. Davis, of West Virginia, and Pettigrew, and John S. Williams, the Democratic leader in the House of Representatives, as well as many other men of great prominence in their respective States. A subcommittee was appointed which considered at great length a draft of a platform which had been prepared, and finally reported the result of its deliberations to the full committee. The tentative platform contained a paragraph setting forth that as there had been in recent years an enormous increase in the production of gold, of which the United States had obtained a large share, the question of the monetary standard had ceased to be a political issue. The "plank" was extremely offensive to Mr. Bryan, who desired and moved that the declaration of the two preceding national conventions on the subject of silver be repeated. In that matter he had no support; but he did argue most strenuously against the adoption of the "gold plank." He also wished to have included in the platform a declaration in favor of an income tax, but in this he was stoutly opposed by Governor Hill. At last the proposition was made that both the gold plank and the income tax plank be omitted. The committee voted—35 to 15—to drop the reference to gold, and to make no declaration whatever on the question of a money standard. Mr. Bryan then withdrew his income tax proposition, and the platform was ready to be reported. The committee had been in continuous session for sixteen hours—from eight o'clock in the evening of Thursday, July 7, until nearly noon of Friday.

When the convention assembled on Friday evening, at 8 o'clock, the platform was read and unanimously adopted. Senator Daniel, of Virginia, who reported it, laid particular stress upon the fact that the committee also was unanimous. The platform was as follows:—

The Democratic party of the United States, in national convention assembled, declares its devotion to the essential principles of the Democratic faith which brings us together in party communion.

Under them, local self-government and national unity and prosperity were alike established. They underlaid our independence, the structure of our free Republic, and every Democratic extension from Louisiana to California and Texas to Oregon, which pre-

served faithfully in all the States the tie between taxation and representation. They yet inspire the masses of our people, guarding jealously their rights and liberties and cherishing their fraternity, peace and orderly development.

They remind us of our duties and responsibilities as citizens, and impress upon us, particularly at this time, the necessity of reform and the rescue of the administration of government from the headstrong, arbitrary and spasmodic methods which distract business by uncertainty, and pervade the public mind with dread, distrust and perturbation.

Wherever there may exist a people incapable of being governed under American laws, in consonance with the American Constitution, the territory of that people ought not to be part of the American domain. We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people upon their feet free and independent to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the Secretary of War by pledging the government's indorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine Islands to make the United States a partner in speculative legislation of the archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of the Democratic Senators in the last session, will, if successful, lead to entanglements from which it will be difficult to escape.

The Democratic party has been and will continue to be the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted through Congressional favor to draw heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous perversion of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure, has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These especial favorites of the government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican party. We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the government, economically administered and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the

friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities" and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation — to wit, the support of the federal government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint products of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under Republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business prosperity. A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust, combination or monopoly tending to destroy these, by controlling production, restricting competition or fixing prices should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discrimination by transportation companies.

As the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade, we demand an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commission to the end that the travelling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief for the abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation. We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations and monopolies, and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to effectually suppress them.

Any trust or unlawful combination engaged in interstate commerce which is monopolizing any branch of business or production should not be permitted to transact business outside of the State of its origin. Whenever it shall be established in any court of competent jurisdiction that such monopolization exists, such prohibition should be enforced through comprehensive laws to be enacted on the subject.

We congratulate our Western citizens upon the passage of the Newlands irrigation act for the irrigation and reclamation of the arid lands at the West, a measure framed by a Democrat, passed in the Senate by a non-partisan vote and passed in the House against the opposition of almost all the Republican leaders by a vote the majority of which was Democratic.

We call attention to this great Democratic measure, broad and comprehensive as it is, working automatically throughout all time, without further action of Congress, until the reclamation of all the land in the arid West capable of reclamation is accomplished, reserving the lands reclaimed for homeseekers in small tracts, and

rigidly guarding against land monopoly, as an evidence of the policy of domestic development contemplated by the Democratic party should it be placed in power.

The Democracy when intrusted with power will construct the Panama Canal speedily, honestly and economically, thereby giving to our people what Democrats have always contended for—a great interoceanic canal, furnishing shorter and cheaper lines of transportation and broader and less trammelled trade relations with the other peoples of the world.

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad, and to use all proper measures to secure for them, whether native-born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of laws and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties of friendship and commerce; and if under existing treaties the right of travel and sojourn is denied to American citizens, or recognition is withheld from American passports by any countries on the ground of race or creed, we favor the beginning of negotiations with the governments of such countries to secure by new treaties the removal of these unjust discriminations. We demand that all over the world a duly authenticated passport issued by the Government of the United States to an American citizen shall be proof of the fact that he is an American citizen and shall entitle him to the treatment due him as such.

We favor the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people.

We favor the admission of the territory of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory. We also favor the immediate admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate States, and a territorial government for Alaska and Porto Rico. We hold that the officials appointed to administer the government of any territory as well as the District of Alaska should be *bona fide* residents at the time of their appointment of the Territory or District in which their duties are to be performed.

We demand the extermination of polygamy within the jurisdiction of the United States and the complete separation of church and state in political affairs.

We denounce the ship subsidy bill recently passed by the United States Senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstructions raised by Republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea. We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the public treasury.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining or commerce.

We favor the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in its full integrity.

We favor the reduction of the army and of army expenditure to a point historically demonstrated to be safe and sufficient.

The Democracy would secure to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Our soldiers and sailors who defend with their lives the Constitution and the laws have a sacred interest in their just administration. They must therefore share with us the humiliation with which we have witnessed the exaltation of court favorites, without distinguished service, over the scarred heroes of many battles, of their aggrandizement by executive appropriation out of the treasuries of a prostrate people in violation of the act of Congress which fixed the compensation of allowances of the military officers.

The Democratic party stands committed to the principles of Civil Service Reform, and we demand their honest, just and impartial enforcement. We denounce the Republican party for its continued and sinister encroachments upon the spirit and operation of Civil Service rules, whereby it has arbitrarily dispensed with examinations for office in the interests of favorites and employed all manner of devices to overreach and set aside the principles upon which Civil Service was established.

The race question has brought countless woes to this country. The calm wisdom of the American people should see to it that it brings no more.

To revive the dead and hateful race and sectional animosities in any part of our common country means confusion, distraction of business and the reopening of wounds now happily healed.

North and South, East and West have but recently stood together in line of battle from the walls of Peking to the hills of Santiago, and as sharers of a common glory and a common destiny we should share fraternally the common burdens.

We therefore deprecate and condemn the Bourbonlike, selfish and narrow spirit of the recent Republican Convention at Chicago, which sought to kindle anew the embers of racial and sectional strife, and we appeal from it to the sober common sense and spirit of the American people.

The existing Republican Administration has been spasmodic,

erratic, sensational, spectacular and arbitrary. It has made itself a satire upon the Congress, the courts and upon the settled practices and usages of national and international law.

It summoned the Congress into hasty and futile extra session and virtually adjourned it, leaving behind its flight from Washington uncalled calendars and unaccomplished tasks.

It made war, which is the sole power of Congress, without its authority, thereby usurping one of its fundamental prerogatives.

It violated a plain statute of the United States, as well as plain treaty obligations, international usages and constitutional law, and has done so under pretence of executing a great public policy which could have been more easily effected lawfully, constitutionally and with honor.

It forced strained and unnatural constructions upon statutes, usurping judicial interpretation and substituting Congressional enactment.

It withdrew from Congress their customary duties of investigation which have heretofore made the representatives of the people and the States the terror of evildoers.

It conducted a secretive investigation of its own and boasted of a few sample convictions, while it threw a broad coverlet over the bureaus which had been their chosen field of operative abuses and kept in power the superior officers under whose administration the crimes had been committed.

It ordered assaults upon some monopolies, but, paralyzed by its first victory, it flung out the flag of truce and cried out that it would not "run amuck," leaving its future purposes beclouded by its vacillations.

Conducting the campaign upon this declaration of our principles and purposes, we invoke for our candidates the support, not only of our great and time-honored organization, but also the active assistance of all of our fellow citizens, who, disregarding past differences, desire the perpetuation of our constitutional government as framed and established by the fathers of the Republic.

The nomination of candidates was now in order. The speeches presenting the merits of "favorite sons" and the second-order speeches numbered more than thirty, and the whole night was occupied in the preliminaries of the vote. When the roll was finally called the result was:—

Alton B. Parker, of New York	658
William R. Hearst, of New York	200
Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri	42
Richard Olney, of Massachusetts	38
Edward C. Wall, of Wisconsin	27

George Gray, of Delaware	12
John S. Williams, of Mississippi	5
Robert E. Pattison, of Pennsylvania	4
George B. McClellan, of New York	3
Nelson A. Miles, of Massachusetts	3
Charles A. Towne, of Minnesota	2
Arthur P. Gorman, of Maryland	2
Bird S. Coler, of New York	1

The whole number of votes was exactly 1000, and 667 (two-thirds) were necessary for a choice. Before the result was declared 19 Hearst votes, and 2 for Senator Gorman were transferred to Parker, giving him 689, and the nomination. The convention then, — at 5.50 A.M., on the morning of Saturday, having been in session ten hours, adjourned until the afternoon. Before that time an unprecedented incident had occurred, the particulars of which were known to only a few of the leaders. It was of such a nature that a hurried adjournment until the late afternoon was ordered. Upon reassembling the convention was not at first informed what had taken place, and the presentation of candidates for Vice-President proceeded. When the roll had been called a delegate from Texas suggested that "we ought not to nominate a candidate for Vice-President at this time. . . . We want to know, before a candidate for Vice-President is nominated, who will be the nominee of this convention for President." No further explanation was given, but probably by this time most of the delegates knew the meaning of Mr. Culberson's surprising statement. A recess of an hour and a half was ordered, and the convention reassembled at 8:30 P.M.

What had occurred was that during the early part of the day one of the New York delegates had received from Judge Parker a telegram in the following terms: —

I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established, and shall act accordingly if the action of the convention to-day shall be ratified by the people. As the platform is silent on the subject, my view should be made known to the convention, and if it is proved to be unsatisfactory to the majority, I request you to decline the nomination for me at once, so that another may be nominated before adjournment.

Although there were cries of "Oh, no!" when the first delegate who referred to the incident said that the despatch had "spread consternation throughout this convention," the re-

mark was justified. Possibly it derived a part of its truth from the fact that a false version of the telegram was published in an evening paper — a version which made Judge Parker declare that he could not accept a nomination unless a plank recognizing the existence by law of the gold standard were inserted in the platform. It was proposed to send to Judge Parker, in the name of the convention, the following reply: —

The platform adopted by this convention is silent on the question of a monetary standard because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues were mentioned in the platform. Therefore, there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform.

Upon a motion to that effect a long and at times acrimonious debate ensued. Some of those who urged the sending of a reply characterized Judge Parker's action as "injudicious" and "unnecessary," but they maintained that the motive was a high sense of honor, and an unwillingness that his opinions should be misunderstood. They said that every one knew, in voting for Parker, that he was a "gold man"; but this last statement was warmly disputed. Mr. Bryan strongly opposed the sending of the telegram. He maintained that if the convention was willing, by so doing, to recognize the gold standard, it should do so openly and in a manly way, in the platform. When the debate closed the convention voted, 794 to 191, that the reply above printed should be sent. The majority would have been somewhat smaller, though still overwhelming, if the votes of many delegations had not been given under the unit rule. This fact was made clear by the announcement of the vote by the chairman of seven or eight delegations.

The convention now proceeded to finish its business by nominating a candidate for Vice-President. The result of the first and only vote was as follows: —

Whole number of votes	977
Necessary for a choice (two thirds of the whole convention).	667
Henry G. Davis, of West Virginia	654
James R. Williams, of Illinois	165
George Turner, of Washington	100
William A. Harris, of Kansas.	58

It was then voted to make the nomination unanimous, and after the appointment of the usual committees the Convention came to an end at 1.30 A.M. on Sunday, July 10.

A meeting of colored men, who called themselves the National Liberty party, was held at St. Louis on July 7. No record of its proceedings has been discovered, save that it nominated for President George E. Taylor, of Iowa, and adopted the following platform:—

We, the delegates of the National Liberty party of the United States, in convention assembled, declare our unalterable faith in the essential doctrine of human liberty, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Under no other doctrine can the people of this or any other country stand together in good friendship and perfect union. Equal liberty is the first concession that a republican form of government concedes to its people, and universal brotherhood is the cementing tie which binds a people to respect the laws.

It has always been so where caste existed and was recognized by law or by common consent, that the oppression of the weaker by the stronger has attained and a degree of human slavery been realized. Such a condition of affairs must necessarily exist where universal suffrage is not maintained and respected, and where one man considers that by nature he was born and by nature dies better than another.

The application of the fundamental principles of the rights of men is always the paramount issue before a people, and when they are strictly adhered to there is no disturbing element to the peace, prosperity, or to the great industrial body politic of the country.

We believe in the supremacy of the civil as against the military law, when and where the civil is respected. But when the civil law has been outraged and wrested from the hands of authority it should be understood that military law may be temporarily instituted.

Law and order should take the place of lynching and mob violence, and polygamy should not survive, but polygamy is more tolerable than lynching, and we regret that a great national party could overlook lynching, and yet denounce polygamy.

Citizens of a democracy should be non-partisans, always casting their votes for the safety of their country and for their best interests, individually and collectively.

The right of any American citizen to support any measure instead of party should not be questioned, and when men conform themselves to party instead of principles they become party slaves. There were 2,500,000 such slaves among our colored population in

1900, all voting strictly to party lines, regardless of their material welfare. We are satisfied that they did not serve their best interest in that section of the country in which the greater number of them live by doing so.

These being our thoughts and ideas of how the Government's affairs should be conducted, we most respectfully submit them to all liberty-loving and Christian-hearted people, that they may act upon them in a spirit of justice and equity, "with good will to all, malice toward none."

We ask for universal suffrage, or qualification which does not discriminate against any reputable citizen on account of color or condition.

We ask that the Federal Government enforce its guarantee to protect its citizens, and secure for them every right given under the Constitution of the United States, wherever and whenever it is necessary.

We appeal to all forms of Catholic and Protestant religions to assist us to awaken the Christian consciences of all classes of the American people, private citizens and officers, to wipe out the greatest shame known to civilized nations of the world, whose very root seems to have planted in this, one of the most proud of all nations of its civilization — "lynch law," the pregnator of anarchism, the most dangerous system to revolutionize our Republic.

We ask that the national laws be so remedied as to give any citizen, being next of kin, the right to demand an indemnity of the National Government for the taking of life or the injuring of any citizen other than by due process of law. And that where the property of a citizen is wilfully destroyed by a mob, the Federal Government shall be held to make restitution to the injured parties.

We demand an increase of the regular army, making six negro regiments instead of four, and an equal chance to colored soldiers to become line officers.

We favor the adjustment of all grievances between the wage earner and the capitalist by equitable resources without injustice to either or by methods of coercion.

We firmly protest against interference of the Government in the Orient until paramount political issues of the races, capital and labor are settled and settled right at home.

We firmly believe that the ex-slaves, who served the country for 246 years, filling the lap of the nation with wealth by their labor, should be pensioned from the overflowing treasury of the country to which they are and have been loyal, both on land and sea, as provided in the bill introduced in the Senate of the United States by Senator Hanna, of the State of Ohio.

We ask that the general Government own and control all public

carriers in the United States, so that the citizens of the United States could not be denied equal accommodations where they pay with the same lawful money provided by the Government as a circulating medium and as a legal tender for all obligations.

The people of the District of Columbia, the capital of the nation, should be given the right to participate in the selection of President and Vice-President of the United States, and should be allowed representation in the two branches of Congress, and the election of a Governor, Mayor, City Council, and such other officers as are necessary for the proper government of the District of Columbia. We indorse the Gallagher resolution looking to the establishment of self-government of the District of Columbia.

The last convention of the canvass was that of the "Continental" party, which was held at Chicago on August 31. Its avowed object was "to unite the disaffected of all parties." In *personnel* it was almost if not quite local in character; for although it was reported that letters had been received from twenty-seven States asking that proxies be appointed for them, it is believed that all of the thirty-four persons who served as "delegates" were residents of Chicago, or of its immediate vicinity. The chairman was Dr. J. P. Lynch, of Illinois. The convention nominated for President Charles H. Howard, of Illinois, and for Vice-President George H. Shirley, of the District of Columbia. Both of those gentlemen declined and the National Committee substituted as candidates Austin H. Holcomb, of Georgia, for President, and A. King, of Missouri, for Vice-President. It does not appear that an electoral ticket was proposed in any State. The platform adopted was as follows:

The Continental party of the United States, in first national convention assembled, in the city of Chicago, August 31, 1904, announces the following platform of principles:

The objects and ends of the Continental party, as set forth in its charter, are: "To enlist the coöperation of legal voters throughout the United States in earnest and honorable efforts to repeal unjust laws in every branch of government, and, in their stead, to secure the enactment and enforcement of other laws better adapted to 'establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare,' and secure the election or appointment to office of honest and capable men."

The questions pertaining to money, the tariff, transportation, trusts and corporations, the race problem, the labor problem, are preëminently live issues, which can never be permanently settled until they are settled right.

Without referring to our trade relations with nations of the Eastern Continent, we declare our adherence to the principles of reciprocity advocated by that eminent statesman, James G. Blaine, as applied to Canada and all American republics. To this end we favor such Congressional action as shall initiate a movement intended to bring about reciprocity to its fullest extent with the entire American Continent. In the language of Mr. Blaine: "There is room for but one commercial flag between Cape Horn and the North Pole."

We believe that the money question is far from being settled, and that it involves not only the gold standard, but the far greater question, namely, Who shall issue and control the paper currency of the nation — the Government or the banks? He who controls the money of a country controls the government of that country. We believe that the money trust is the mother of all other trusts; that it is international in its scope; that it has duplicate headquarters — London and New York; that its power exceeds, in many particulars, the power of the Government itself; that it controls legislation by controlling the political party in power; that through its agents it secured the nomination of the Presidential candidates of both the Republican and Democratic parties and dictated the main planks of their national platforms. We believe that it is this subserviency of the two leading political parties of this country to the money trust that is fast placing the wealth of the country into the hands of a few individuals, reducing to penury and want millions of the laboring and middle classes and establishing in this land of former freedom a plutocracy which threatens to be more arbitrary in its demands than any monarchy of the Old World. "To coin money and regulate the value thereof" is a function of the National Government, which the Constitution has denied to the States, but which the Republican party has delegated, in part, to corporations.

As a check to the encroachments of the money power we advocate the following demands:—

The act authorizing national banks to issue notes of credit should be repealed. All money of every description should be issued by the general Government, and be equal in value, dollar for dollar.

Postal banks for deposit and check should be established — one in every city, county-town and village, the surplus funds thus accruing to be loaned to the people at interest not exceeding 3 per cent per annum.

The one hundred and twelve million dollars Government funds deposited in banks should be withdrawn and loaned to the several States on deposit of State bonds.

Constantly recurring accidents on all lines of railroad, causing

great loss of life and the crippling and mangling of hundreds of passengers, demand the most searching investigation and prompt and efficient legal remedies whereby railroads shall be operated for the safety and convenience of the public, rather than for the purpose of declaring the usual dividend on watered stock. During the year 1901 the railroads of England, which are owned and operated by the Government, transported an immense number of passengers without a single fatality. In this country a person virtually takes his life in his hand when he steps aboard a train of cars. We believe that the fatalities of railroad travel in the United States can be traced directly to the employment of cheap and careless employés, the overworking of engineers and conductors, and the neglect to take proper precautions against accidents, with a view to "cut down operating expenses," and thus enable railroad officials to declare the usual dividends to stockholders. As a remedy for such abuses we demand the prosecution for manslaughter of the principal officers of a railroad company on whose line the death of a passenger shall be traced directly to the carelessness or incompetency of their employés, or to their incapacity caused by long hours of continuous labor.

To give work to the unemployed, furnish cheaper and more equitable rates of transportation, insure the safety and convenience of the travelling public, and test the practicability of government ownership of railroads, the United States Government should at once proceed to construct, equip and operate one or more lines of four-track railway, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, and one or more similar lines from the Gulf of Mexico to points near our northern boundary.

We believe in the right of labor to organize for the benefit and protection of those who toil. Capital is organized, and has no right to deny labor the privilege which it claims for itself. Intelligent organization of labor is demanded to preserve the rights of the laborer. It raises the standard of workmanship and promotes the efficiency, intelligence, independence and character of the wage earner. We believe with Abraham Lincoln that labor is prior to capital and is not its slave, but its companion, and we plead for that broad spirit of tolerance and justice which will promote industrial peace through the observance of just principles of arbitration. We favor the enactment of legislation looking to the improvement in conditions for wage earners, the abolition of child labor, the suppression of sweat-shops and of convict labor in competition with free labor, and the exclusion from American shores of foreign pauper labor and Asiatic labor of every nationality. We favor the shorter workday, and declare that eight hours shall constitute the maximum workday in all manufacturing establishments, workshops,

mines and all other industrial establishments, and that where great skill and responsibility are required of an employé, as in the case of railroad engineers, train despatchers, steamboat employés, etc., no person should be continuously employed more than six hours of the twenty-four.

All railroad and other corporations doing business in two or more States should be chartered by Congress, and then only after a close scrutiny of their capitalization, a strict investigation revealing their intentions, and a most guarded restriction of their powers and operations. The creating of "corners" and the establishing of exorbitant prices for products necessary to human existence should be made a criminal offence against the officers, directors and stockholders of a corporation so offending, subjecting them to severest penalties. A man is no less a robber because he is able to hold up his victim by due process of law.

The Philippines, the same as Cuba, should be guaranteed ultimate independence and a stable government under the protection of the United States.

The Congressional district, instead of the State, should be made the unit in the Electoral College, apportioning to each district one Presidential elector, to be chosen by the voters of that district.

We demand such legislation as will place the burdens of government upon that class of people who have been most favored by special acts of government, and to this end we favor a graduated property tax, exempting from its provisions property of the individual to the amount of \$10,000 or less. We also demand that a 10 per cent tax be levied annually upon all unoccupied and unimproved land.

We demand the enactment by the several States of a primary election law, by which all candidates for public office shall be selected by direct vote of the people, without the aid of a delegate convention. We denounce government by the gavel in party conventions, and demand the elimination of the party "boss" from party politics, by whatever method it can be brought about.

The election laws of the several States should be changed, by constitutional amendment when necessary, so as to provide for direct legislation by the method known as the initiative and referendum.

Each State should possess the sole right to determine by legislation the qualifications required of voters within its jurisdiction, irrespective of race, color or sex.

The Constitution of the United States should be revised and amended in accordance with the method provided in Article V., that our fundamental law may answer the demands of a century of civilization and progress.

Believing our demands to be practicable and just, we appeal to all who believe in majority rule, to all who are weary of Standard Oil government, to all who are opposed to gavel government in party politics, and to all others who desire the welfare of all the people, to unite with us in advocating the principles herein enunciated until they shall be enacted into laws for the government of this Republic — a Republic founded by Washington and Jefferson and the Continental Congress, and first defended and protected by the Continental Army of the United States.

The canvass that ensued was spiritless almost beyond precedent ; and although there were the usual optimistic claims on the part of the Democrats, and the customary real or simulated fears on the part of the Republicans, the result was at no time doubtful. The policy of the Democrats turned out to be a mistake at every point. Mr. Bryan, who was indisputably the leader of the faction which was for the moment thrust into the background, "supported the ticket," but he did so in such a half-hearted manner that his support was no help to the party. Immediately after the close of the convention he expressed his real opinion by saying that little could be hoped from a Democratic victory so long as the party was "under the control of the Wall-Street element." Judge Parker's nomination, he remarked, "virtually nullifies the anti-trust plank" of the platform ; and the labor plank was "straddling and meaningless." He found enough in Judge Parker to "justify me in giving him my vote but," — and so forth. He announced his purpose, as soon as the election should be over "to marshal the friends of popular government within the Democratic party to the support of a radical and progressive policy."

Such language as that could not inspire the earnest men who still looked to him as their "peerless leader" to exert themselves greatly in favor of the ticket. They did not. Many of them came out openly in support of Mr. Roosevelt whom, by instinct, they felt to be more favorable to "a radical and progressive policy" than was Judge Parker. In still larger numbers they outwardly preserved their regularity as party men by maintaining silence ; but they were determined to vote against Parker, and when the day of election came they did so. The great increase of the Socialist and independent Populist vote in November is to be explained, not by the growth of these parties but by the revolt of radicals against the new policy of the Democratic party. The magnitude of that revolt is made still

more impressive when we take account of the attitude of the Gold Democrats who returned to their allegiance on the elimination of Mr. Bryan and the silver agitation, and of the smaller but not altogether insignificant number of Republicans who were estranged from Mr. Roosevelt by reason of his progressive radicalism.

One of the delegates to the Democratic convention, a senator of the United States, said in reference to the platform, "we have adopted a document but not a policy." Therein lay the second mistake. The tariff, in 1892; silver at 16 to 1, in 1896; imperialism, in 1900, had been "paramount" issues. In 1904 there was no real issue. There were the remnants of old controversies, on every one of which the Democrats had been defeated, but on all of them the party was timid. It reasserted its position on some of them in cautious language, hoping to win back erring brethren, but it said nothing to rally those who had fought its recent battles, nothing that attracted recruits from the opposing line. The orators had nothing to talk about except the sins of the Republican party, and the sins they cited did not seem enormous to those who had previously supported the party. Silver, as an issue, was dead. Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, in the final debate in the Democratic convention, on the reply to be given to Judge Parker's telegram, challenged any member of the body to express the opinion that silver would be an issue in the campaign, and no one responded. "Imperialism," too, did not alarm the people; and the country was still so prosperous under — which does not necessarily mean because of — the Dingley tariff, that it was not a favorable issue to arouse votes against the administration. So the speaking campaign was listless — of course on both sides — for aside from an attack on the financial extravagance alleged against the Republicans, there was little to defend.

It must be said also that the Democrats were unfortunate in their candidates. It was almost universally admitted that it was a mistake to nominate for the vice-presidency a man in his eighty-second year. Otherwise there was no objection urged, or possible, against Mr. Davis. Nor was there any objection possible against Judge Parker on the ground of his personal honor and integrity, or of his sincerity, or of his patriotism. But he was unknown, and his long-time judicial aloofness had made him incapable, by disuse of the faculty, of making himself known and popular. At first he determined not to make any

speeches except to those who might call upon him at his open porch in Esopus. But when the canvass dragged his advisers counselled him to abandon that determination. He did accordingly hold meetings and address the voters in New York and the near-by States, but again his lack of practice in the art of popular oratory was a disadvantage. He could not arouse enthusiasm, and his excursions into the field of national finance, and his treatment of the trust question, gave the journals and the orators on the other side opportunities to question his knowledge of matters with which, should he be elected, he would have to deal.

1 All these things worked in favor of the Republicans. They profited more from the weakness of the opposition than from their own merit. Originally, when slavery was the great and almost the only issue, they were a radical party, — radical also on the minor issues, such as they were. They were radical in reconstruction times, radical protectionists then and later. But when their policies were triumphant they gradually became conservative. Although never unanimous, they were on the whole conservative on the entire series of issues affecting the public debt and the currency — payment of the fifty-two bonds, the national banks, inflation of the greenback currency, and silver coinage. They were conservative in respect of their own protective tariff policy. They were opposed to every item of the Populist programme. Now they were exposed to a new influence. The President, their President, their candidate in the approaching election, was frankly radical. He was decidedly favorable to some of the most progressive measures of the radical opposition, against which the party had previously set its face. The situation was peculiar. One party overwhelmingly controlled by radicals, when they chose to exercise their power; the other quite as strongly conservative by preference, but willingly placing itself under the leadership of a frank radical, who made no secret of his intention to lead the party to adopt radicalism. In a certain sense both candidates were misplaced. There may come a time when men — all men — will emancipate themselves from party ties whenever their party goes whither they do not wish to follow. But that time had not come in 1904. What happened is what might have been expected to happen. It is a peculiarity of the conservative that he adheres to party more closely than does the radical. Witness, for examples, the sudden growth of the

Greenback party, and of the Populist party. Witness the fact that although there were numerous secessions from the Democratic party in 1896 on the silver question, a vast majority of the conservative element which it still contained—Judge Parker among the rest—voted for Mr. Bryan, though they were absolutely opposed to the free coinage of silver, which was the one question at issue. Witness now, that the conservative element, at the time overwhelmingly predominant in the Republican party, supported the radical candidate in preference to the conservative, and thus acquiesced in the plan of the leader to transform the body into a radical party.

Herein lies the explanation both of the tameness of the canvass and of the result. Neither party as a whole had a positive programme. One of the candidates was extraordinarily popular, and so strong a man in personality, so persuasive and sincere in his acts and motives, that resistance to his leadership was futile. He held his former supporters and attracted throngs of former opponents. The other candidate was—through no fault of his own—not popular because not known, and incapacitated by lack of experience to become a leader. He could not hold those who had gloried in the leadership of Bryan; he could not detach even the conservative Republicans from Roosevelt. The consequence was a “landslide.”

The election of electors took place on November 8. The result is shown on page 137.

The total popular vote was 13,523,108,—a decrease of more than 460,000 from the election of 1900, and nearly 430,000 less than that cast eight years before, in 1896. The Republican vote was almost 400,000 greater in 1904 than in 1900; the Democratic vote decreased more than a million and a quarter; the combined votes for the minor candidates increased more than 400,000. These figures indicate in a general way the more important movements of the voters. We must make allowance for a normal increase in the number of men qualified to vote. In all probability not less than a million and a half of those who classed themselves as Democrats failed to support the ticket at the polls. Not far from a half of that number voted either for Mr. Roosevelt or for one of the minor candidates. The other half abstained from voting. It is interesting to analyze the vote geographically, as by that process we can discover where the defection was most pronounced. In

1904

STATES	POPULAR VOTE						ELECTORAL VOTE	
	Roosevelt and Fairbanks Republican	Parker and Davis Democratic	Swallow and Carroll Prohibition	Debs and Hanford Socialist	Correagan and Cox Socialist Labor	Watson and Tibbles Populist	Roosevelt and Fairbanks	Parker and Davis
Alabama	22472	79857	612	853	-	5051	-	11
Arkansas	46860	64434	993	1816	-	2318	-	9
California	205226	89404	7380	29535	-	-	10	-
Colorado	134687	100105	3438	4304	235	824	5	-
Connecticut	111089	72909	1506	4543	575	495	7	-
Delaware	23712	19359	607	146	-	51	3	-
Florida	8314	27040	5	2337	-	1605	-	5
Georgia	24003	83472	685	197	-	22635	-	13
Idaho	47783	18480	1013	4949	-	353	3	-
Illinois	632645	327606	34770	69225	4698	6725	27	-
Indiana	368289	274335	23496	12013	1598	2444	15	-
Iowa	307907	149141	11601	14847	-	2207	13	-
Kansas	212955	86174	7306	15869	-	6253	10	-
Kentucky	205277	217170	6609	3602	596	2511	-	13
Louisiana	5205	47708	-	995	-	-	-	9
Maine	64438	27649	1510	2103	-	-	6	-
Maryland	109497	109446	3034	2247	-	-	1	7
Massachusetts	257822	165772	4286	13604	2365	1290	16	-
Michigan	364957	135392	13441	9042	1036	1159	14	-
Minnesota	216651	55187	6253	11692	974	2103	11	-
Mississippi	3187	53374	-	392	-	1424	-	10
Missouri	321449	296312	7191	13009	1674	4226	18	-
Montana	34932	21773	335	5676	208	1520	3	-
Nebraska	138558	52921	6323	7412	-	20518	8	-
Nevada	6864	3982	-	925	-	344	3	-
New Hampshire	54163	34074	750	1090	-	83	4	-
New Jersey	245164	164516	6845	9587	2680	3705	12	-
New York	859533	683981	20787	36883	9127	7459	39	-
North Carolina	82442	124121	361	124	-	819	-	12
North Dakota	52595	14273	1140	2117	-	165	4	-
Ohio	600095	344674	19339	36260	2633	1392	23	-
Oregon	60455	17521	3806	7619	-	753	4	-
Pennsylvania	840949	337998	33717	21863	2211	-	34	-
Rhode Island	41605	24839	768	956	488	-	4	-
South Carolina	2554	52563	-	22	-	1	-	9
South Dakota	72083	21969	2965	3138	-	1240	4	-
Tennessee	105369	131653	1891	1354	-	2506	-	12
Texas	51242	167200	3995	2791	421	8062	-	13
Utah	62446	33413	-	5767	-	-	3	-
Vermont	40459	9777	792	859	-	-	4	-
Virginia	47880	80650	1382	218	56	359	-	12
Washington	101540	28098	3329	10023	1592	669	5	-
West Virginia	132628	100881	4600	1572	-	339	7	-
Wisconsin	280315	124205	9672	28240	223	530	13	-
Wyoming	20489	8930	217	1077	-	-	3	-
Total	7628785	5084442	258950	402895	33490	114546	336	140

round numbers the vote of the New England States, for the leading candidates, at the two elections was as follows :—

	1900	1904
Republican.....	539,000	569,600
Democratic.....	336,000	335,000

In these States, naturally conservative, the Democrats held their own fairly well, and the total vote showed an increase of between three and four per cent, all of which went to the Republicans.

In the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the vote stood thus :—

	1900	1904
Republican.....	1,756,400	1,945,600
Democratic.....	1,267,400	1,184,000

Here again the change was slight—an increase of about 100,000 in the total vote, a little more than three per cent; a loss of nearly 100,000 by the Democrats, a gain of nearly 200,000 by the Republicans, both of which changes were largely in Pennsylvania. But as we go westward the tendency becomes more marked. In Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan, the totals were

	1900	1904
Republican.....	1,794,200	1,963,900
Democratic.....	1,499,200	1,080,800

A loss of 420,000 by the Democrats, offset by a gain of 170,000 by the Republicans, and a decided decrease in the total popular vote. The Democratic loss in the four States was 28 per cent. The group of Western States consisting of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, made this showing :—

	1900	1904
Republican.....	1,162,200	1,278,600
Democratic.....	817,500	501,300

In these States the total vote decreased 220,000, or eleven per cent. The Republicans increased their vote 116,000; the Democrats lost more than 300,000,—a decline of 38 per cent. The other States of the Northwest and the Pacific Coast, nine in number, where Mr. Bryan had been strongest voted thus :—

	1900	1904
Republican	479,800	674,400
Democratic.....	454,000	321,500

The total vote increased about six per cent, but whereas the Republicans gained almost 200,000 the Democrats lost 130,000, the decrease being almost 30 per cent. Finally we have the sixteen Southern States from Delaware to Texas, in some of which the contest was close, but in others there was no contest. Their totals were:—

	1900	1904
Republican	1,488,500	1,244,400
Democratic.....	1,983,900	1,656,600

Here the total vote decreased more than 570,000—a number greater by 110,000 than the decrease in the country as a whole—and nearly 17 per cent. The Republicans lost 244,000; the Democrats 327,000. But the figures as to that part of the country are of little significance, since the voters of that region are largely unaffected by events and movements that have a powerful influence elsewhere.

Upon a general survey we see that, as we should expect, the radicalism which is more prevalent and more intense as one proceeds westward, manifested itself in a more extensive revolt against the conservative attitude of the Democratic party in this canvass, and in increased support of Mr. Roosevelt who was regarded as more inclined to radicalism than Judge Parker.

The leading politicians of both parties seem to have been astounded by the magnitude and thoroughness of the Republican victory. Mr. Parker issued a statement in which he made it clear that he had anticipated defeat, but he declared that he did not regret having undertaken the contest against overwhelming odds. Mr. Roosevelt, late in the evening of election day, when the result of the voting was sufficiently known, sent out to the press of the country the following statement, which was destined in after years to be the subject of much discussion:—

I am deeply sensitive of the honor done me by the American people in thus expressing their confidence in what I have done and have tried to do. I appreciate to the full the solemn responsibility that confidence imposes upon me, and I shall do all that in my power lies not to forfeit it. On the 4th of March next I

shall have served three and a half years, and that three and a half years constitutes my first term. The wise custom which limits the President to two terms regards the substance and not the form, and under no circumstances will I be a candidate for or accept another nomination.

Although, on numerous occasions afterward, the hopes of his enthusiastic partisans and the fears of opponents in his own party pictured him as being forced to depart from the resolution thus expressed, or induced by his strong desire to carry out his measures to reconsider that resolution voluntarily, he never gave the least countenance to any suggestion of that nature. Even so early as May, 1905, when an Omaha newspaper urged that if Congress refused to pass such a railroad law as he proposed he would be compelled to accept a nomination in 1908, he sent to that paper a statement in which he said: "You are authorized to state that I will not again be a candidate for the office of President of the United States. There are no strings to this statement. I mean it."

The counting of the electoral votes proceeded without any incident. The inauguration was an occasion of perhaps unequalled brilliancy in the history of such ceremonies. It was estimated that there were more than two hundred thousand visitors in Washington on the 4th of March. The President had for an escort his "Rough Riders" of the campaign in Cuba, and there were also in the procession a party of Filipino scouts, a native battalion from Porto Rico, Indian chiefs, and other picturesque groups. The oath of office was administered by Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, and the inaugural address was delivered in the presence of an immense throng of people.

III

THE ERA OF "PROGRESSIVE" INSURGENCY

PERSPECTIVE is necessary for the final and authoritative writing of history. It is indispensable in the case of such a period as the second administration of Theodore Roosevelt. It will be many years yet before a sound judgment can be pronounced upon the events of those four years, and upon their effect. It may be inaccurate even to use the word events, for although many measures were adopted, the period, in so far as it differed widely from the years that preceded it, was one of agitation rather than of accomplishment. The agitator was the President himself, who differed in a marked degree, in temperament, in method, in activity, from any of his predecessors. During his first term he observed, as loyally as it was possible for one constituted as he was, the pledge he gave, when assuming the office upon the death of President McKinley, to maintain the policy which that death had interrupted. Yet he gave, even then, indications which — as was noted in the last chapter — gave disquiet to some of the most prominent and therefore most influential members of the Republican party. That party, as he found it, was conservative, and the men who were distrustful of Mr. Roosevelt were conservative. Notwithstanding their apprehensions, they did not openly oppose his nomination for a second term, and after the nomination they worked earnestly and successfully for his election.

That election, which he had a right to interpret as a mandate from the people to adopt and urge his own policies, left Mr. Roosevelt free to depart as widely as he might see fit from the standards and methods which he had inherited, and to introduce new issues into national politics, or to modify the views and treatment of issues already brought before the people, but not yet "paramount." It could cause no strain upon his own conscience, and it could not be a just ground of complaint, on the part of those who had, however willingly or unwillingly, voted for him, that his policy should be radical. He had revealed the fact that he was not a conservative like the con-

servatives who composed a majority of Congress, but was, with reference to the new issues at least, a radical. In spite of that revelation he had been elected by an immense majority, — the greatest majority ever given to a President. Hence he did not betray his party, nor did he practise any deception upon the people. But he did partially transform his party, and introduced divisions the consequences of which it must be left to the future historian to study and analyze.

The chief difficulty which is experienced by one who undertakes to recount the occurrences and note the changes which he has observed as current events — let us confine the statement to the four years from 1905 to 1909 — is that of concealing a bias on one side or the other — for or against radicalism. But it is possible to present the facts impartially and to repress partisanship to its narrowest limits. If the facts are presented truly, readers will interpret them for themselves.

The situation was extraordinary. Mr. Roosevelt at the time of the election, and probably ever since, possessed a personal, as distinguished from a political, popularity greater than that of any other President, unless General Jackson was an exception. Nor was his political popularity much if any less than that of any one of his predecessors who was twice elected. There was more opposition within the Republican party to the reëlection of Lincoln in 1864, and to that of Grant in 1872, than to that of Roosevelt in 1904; and neither Lincoln nor Grant received a tithe of the secret support, or of the number of silent votes from Democrats that Roosevelt received. Moreover, there was never a whisper or a suspicion on the part of any one attached to any party that the President was insincere, or that he was animated by any but the best and most worthy motives to do that which he conceived to be for the welfare of the country and the triumph of righteousness. Such suspicions arose only at a later period with which we have here nothing to do.

His opponents might and did think that he was at times arbitrary in his action, that he was impulsive, that he made mistakes in his earnest haste to do right, and that he was too sure that his own way was right and that any other way, or any opposition to his way, must be wrong. But those were apparently the opinions of a minority only, and that minority was composed chiefly of men in public life, certainly of men who took more than an average interest in public affairs. The

people, as distinguished from these, trusted him, believed in him, were glad to follow enthusiastically where he might lead them. This is as much as to say that there was no effective opposition. Not on the part of the Democrats, who said in a spirit which was not altogether a mock complaint that he had stolen their platform; not on the part of the Republicans, a large number of whom — were they a majority of the whole party? — applauded, while the rest were deterred, by their unwillingness to divide the party as well as by the hopelessness of the undertaking, from directly and openly opposing him. It is certain that the secret opposition to the President's social and economic policies was more rife in Congress than it was in the country at large, possibly more so than in any part of the country. The course adopted in the Senate and House of Representatives was to listen to the President's recommendations, express an academic approval of the measures he urged, and enact into law as few of them as possible. But his policies remained, and the new issues survived to be dealt with as they might be by the next administration.

At no period in the national history were the matters which engrossed the attention of Congress and of the people more numerous or more various than in the four years we are now to consider. It was all owing to the prodigious activity of the President's mind and to his extraordinary energy. He was unable to concentrate that energy on one object at a time. He always had a long programme of reforms, and turned swiftly from one to another, representing each in turn to be of the utmost importance. In mentioning the leading events of the time it becomes necessary to classify them and largely to disregard chronological order. Many of the events and of the problems discussed, but not solved at the time, had no influence, or at the most but a slight influence, upon the ensuing election, which is our chief theme. Nevertheless they were so involved with other events and agitations which did play a part in the election of 1908 that they cannot be overlooked.

One State was admitted to the Union during Mr. Roosevelt's second administration. Oklahoma had almost four hundred thousand inhabitants in 1900, and was even then entitled to admission with two representatives. It would lead us too far astray to inquire why it was not admitted, but undoubtedly one of the reasons was that many men insisted that the claims of Arizona and of New Mexico should be considered at the

same time. At all events, when the question came up for decision there was a general disposition to link together the fortunes of the three proposed new States. For it was assumed at the outset that the Indian Territory would be incorporated with Oklahoma. Indeed, a movement to make that Territory an independent State met with little favor in the Territory itself, when the matter was submitted to a "referendum." The situation was this: there was no open and avowed opposition to the admission of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State, though the apprehension of a loss of political power by the addition of two Democrats to the Senate made many Republicans lukewarm, and possibly explains their willingness to complicate the case with those of Arizona and New Mexico. Neither of those Territories had sufficient population in 1900 to entitle it to one representative, but New Mexico had undoubtedly increased enough by 1905 to contain the necessary quota of population. But there were strong objections to erecting into States communities so sparsely settled, objections which gained strength from a consideration of the Mexican origin of many of the inhabitants. It was therefore proposed to make one State of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, and one of New Mexico and Arizona. The original position of the Republicans, most of them, was — this or nothing. The Democrats were strongly in favor of admitting New Mexico and Arizona as separate States. The proposition to unite them encountered great popular opposition in Arizona. Ultimately it was proposed to admit them as one State in case — the question to be submitted to popular vote — the people of both Territories should agree to the Union. Otherwise they must wait.

The subject occupied a large part of the time of Congress during the session of 1905-06. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives in the form just noted. The Senate amended it by striking out all reference to Arizona and New Mexico, and in the end an agreement was reached upon that disposition of the matter. On the 16th of June, 1906, the President signed the act admitting Oklahoma. The new State met the hopes of the Democrats and the fears of the Republicans by sending to Washington two Democratic senators and four Democratic members of the House of the five to which it was entitled.

The government had upon its hands during this administration an unusually large number of matters in its relation with foreign governments. Venezuela continued to be a thorn in its

side. The government of Castro refused to submit to an impartial tribunal any of the questions on which it took issue with the United States, maintaining that they were all strictly within the jurisdiction of Venezuelan courts, which, on the theory of the complete sovereignty of the republic, would have been an incontrovertible position were it not for the fact that the courts were under the complete control of the dictator. President Roosevelt sent a commissioner to Bogota to investigate, but no definite action was taken to enforce American demands.

Santo Domingo came once more into the field of American diplomacy. That republic had for many years been cursed by revolutions, the aim of most if not all the insurgents having been to obtain possession of the custom houses and of the public funds. A heavy foreign debt had been incurred, which no dictator pretended to recognize to the extent of paying the interest, to say nothing of the principal. There was no good answer to foreign governments which might ask how the United States justified a refusal either to permit them to collect the debts due to their subjects, or itself to take steps to compel Santo Domingo to meet its obligations. A plan was agreed upon involving (1) an amicable scaling-down of the foreign debt to an amount which the republic might be able to meet; (2) placing the collection of customs in the hands of a selected American officer; and (3) a division of the funds collected between the government of Santo Domingo and the foreign creditors. The President undertook to carry out the arrangement without submitting it to ratification by the Senate, which was beyond question entitled to a voice in the matter, not only of becoming an agent for collecting and distributing the funds of a foreign government, but of the stipulation contained in the original "protocol" that the United States would maintain the integrity of the republic and the stability of the government. Owing to the storm of protest against the independent action of the President, a formal treaty was drawn and was submitted to the Senate in February, 1905. In a special message, on March 6, the President strongly urged the ratification of the treaty, but the Senate adjourned without acting upon it. In February, 1907, the Senate ratified a treaty on the subject by which the arrangement as to the collection and distribution of Dominican revenue became effective; but the treaty contained no engagement on the part of the United States to become responsible for Dominican sovereignty.

In the summer of 1906 the United States was obliged to perform a duty which rested upon it as a result of the war with Spain. The condition of Cuba was comparatively peaceful during the first term of President Palma. But as the time drew near for the election of his successor, there were disturbances. His political opponents accused the government of offences against the political liberty of the citizens. They charged it with suppressing opposition and with measures that would make a free election impossible. It is certain that the whole influence of the Cuban administration was exerted to compass the reelection of Señor Palma. He was elected and an insurrection took place. At first the Cuban government professed itself able to deal with the insurgents, but the evil grew and became unmanageable. The situation was already serious in August. On September 13 United States marines were landed on Cuban soil as a precautionary measure, and on the next day President Roosevelt issued a warning to Cubans, urging peace, and assuring them that unless they should maintain order the United States would intervene. The warning was not heeded. On the 25th President Palma found it no longer possible to withstand the insurrection and resigned his office. Thereupon the United States took control of the government and installed a governor-general at Havana. The courts and the civil offices were still administered by Cubans, and Cuban laws were in force. The people were assured that when there should be a reasonable prospect that they could be trusted to govern themselves peaceably the government would be restored to them. There were many persons in both countries who believed that in the end Cuba would be absorbed in the United States, and undoubtedly many persons wished that result. But the promise was sincere and the engagement to restore the government to the Cubans was loyally carried out.

A Pan-American conference was held at Rio de Janeiro, beginning on July 23, 1906. So far as the United States was concerned, the meeting was chiefly notable from the fact that it was attended by Mr. Root, the Secretary of State. Mr. Root was the object of extraordinary attention and hospitality. He made many speeches at the conference, or in connection with it, and won the hearts of the South American people by his pacific and tactful utterances. Before his return he made a tour of several of the South American countries and was everywhere received with great enthusiasm. The labors of the con-

ference were not fruitful in large consequences. No single conference can modify national character or dissipate such national jealousies as exist between the Latin-American republics. But every such meeting serves to improve their mutual relations to a certain extent.

The Russo-Japanese War which began when, on February 8, 1904, Admiral Togo engaged the Russian fleet at Port Arthur, was waged with fury for sixteen months. At the end of that time President Roosevelt took a step which, although without precedent in history, won for him great credit and lasting fame. He undertook, and succeeded in the undertaking, to bring about a cessation of hostilities and a conference between the belligerent powers. He consulted with the representatives in Washington of the Russian and Japanese governments and found that neither would object to a suggestion from him that they bring the war to a speedy conclusion. The American ambassador at St. Petersburg had an audience with the Tsar, and called his attention to that clause of the Hague Convention which provides that an intermediary advance shall never be considered as an unfriendly act by disputing powers. The Tsar having consented to receive a communication from the President, Mr. Roosevelt, on June 8, addressed identical notes to St. Petersburg and Tokio.

He expressed the opinion that the time had come when "in the interest of all mankind he must endeavor to see if it is not possible to bring to an end the terrible and lamentable conflict now being waged." The United States was friendly to both countries, and hoped for the welfare of each. He urged them to open direct negotiations with each other, "without any intermediary," and offered to do anything that the two powers might wish him to do, in arranging the preliminaries as to the time and place of the meeting. The proposition was accepted, plenipotentiaries were appointed by each government, and the meeting was held at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where, on September 5, a treaty of peace was signed.

An agitation against the Japanese residing in San Francisco broke out in 1906. It was similar in motive to the long-standing hostility of the labor element in the same city toward the Chinese, but took a different method of expression. It was aimed against the Japanese children and youth who had been allowed to attend the public schools with pupils of native and other foreign parentage. The school authorities adopted a reg-

ulation forbidding the admission of Japanese to the schools. This was justly regarded as a grievance by the Japanese population of the city, and also by the government of Japan, as being a violation of the treaty obligations of the United States. The movement against the children was one feature of an agitation to exclude Japanese immigrants altogether, as Chinese were already excluded. It was covertly encouraged by irresponsible Americans who were predicting and even openly advocating a war with Japan. The situation was not very serious, in view of the nearly unanimous desire of the people to be on good terms with Japan, save in the fact that the general government had no power over the city government of San Francisco and could not abrogate the acts of the school committee. But by dint of persuasion and warning addressed to the city authorities, and by tactful diplomacy with Japan, the difficulty was composed. The Japanese government, which was sincerely opposed to the emigration of its people, undertook to put a stop to emigration by a system of passports, which does not allow Japanese laborers to leave the country, and the school committee of San Francisco withdrew its obnoxious regulation.

Before the close of the administration an informal but most important arrangement, more nearly like a national alliance than anything in the previous history of the country, was concluded with Japan. It was the result of several months of correspondence between Ambassador Takahira and Secretary Root, and took the form of identical notes exchanged by the two governments on the 30th of November, 1908. Following is the text of the notes : —

I. It is the wish of the two governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

II. The policy of both governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing *status quo*, in the region above mentioned, and to the defence of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

III. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

IV. They are also determined to preserve the common interests of all powers in China by supporting, by all pacific means at their disposal, the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in the empire.

V. Should any event occur threatening the *status quo*, as above described, or the principle of equal opportunity, as above described, it remains for the two governments to communicate with each other, in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

It was a mere declaration of intention on the part of the two governments, and in no sense binding as an alliance would be; it was, as Takahira expressed it, "something like a transaction between trusted friends," but it was universally regarded as a momentous event, and a complete answer to the fears — or the hopes — of those who foresaw a great naval struggle with Japan looming up before the country.

The list of great public measures submitted to Congress during this administration is portentously long. The list of those which were enacted into law is much shorter, but probably of greater length than is exhibited by the history of any previous Congress except the First. Among the measures which failed, some of them of the class which the English term "hardy annuals," were ship subsidies, currency reform, national regulation of insurance, regulation of child labor, copyright reform, Philippine tariff, the admission of Porto Ricans as citizens, limitation of injunctions in labor cases, prohibition of over-capitalization of corporations, and some other measures which formed a part of the President's policy, to be mentioned presently. Among those which were passed may be noted briefly — although some of them were of far-reaching importance — the meat-inspection law; the pure-food law; a codification and improvement of the laws regulating naturalization; the law limiting the hours of labor of employes of railway companies engaged in inter-State commerce; the law giving the government a limited right of appeal in criminal cases; a service pension for all veterans of the Civil War more than sixty-two years old; and an act prohibiting contributions to political campaign funds by public corporations, — but the sister bill providing for publicity of campaign funds and expenditures was defeated.

There were other measures, some of which were and some were not passed, which must be mentioned at greater length. They were expressive of the President's emphatic views on many questions of public policy, — his hostility to "trusts," his strong opinions on the subject of "overgrown fortunes" and "predatory wealth," his sympathy with organized labor,

his advocacy of national regulation of corporations and particularly of control of railways and supervision of their rates.

In 1906 an act was passed imposing liability upon all common carriers engaged in inter-State commerce for all injuries suffered by their employés while in the service of the carrier. In a suit appealed to the Supreme Court it was decided that the act was unconstitutional, inasmuch as it applied to injuries received when the employé was engaged in other than inter-State business. Accordingly another "employers' liability" act was passed, approved April 22, 1908, giving the right to claim damages to "any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier in such [that is, inter-State] commerce." This was a measure strongly and persistently urged by the President.

Undoubtedly the most important law passed during the administration was that regulating railroad rates. It covered many more points than that of rate regulation. Most of the points were noncontroversial, but there was a strong conservative opposition to the provision conferring upon the Inter-State Commerce Commission the right to fix maximum rates of freight and passenger business, and particularly to a denial of the right of railway companies to appeal from rate decisions by the Commission to the courts. The subject occupied a large part of the time of Congress, and mutually contradictory votes were passed. The President was most strenuous in opposition to any court review clause, but ultimately professed himself satisfied with the compromise and limited review sanctioned by the bill as it was passed. It became a law on June 29, 1906. It included among common carriers express and sleeping-car companies, and pipe lines for conveying oil; and as to railroads it extended to such matters as terminals, storage, icing and ventilation. It forbade railway companies to be engaged in the transportation of any articles produced directly or indirectly by themselves, except lumber,—a provision which was intended to prohibit such companies from being concerned in the mining of coal, or from the transportation and sale of coal mined by themselves. It contained strict rules limiting the issue of free passes, and drastic clauses against giving or receiving rebates, with severe penalties attached to violation of the regulation. It provided that no changes in rates should be made except upon at least thirty days' notice; and it authorized the Inter-State Commerce Commission to prepare a uniform system of accounts, and to require all companies within the jurisdiction of the law to

adopt the system and to keep no other accounts. All these provisions were subsidiary to the grand purpose of the act, namely, to give the Inter-State Commerce Commission, enlarged to seven members, power to fix maximum rates on inter-State commerce transportation, which involved the power to refuse its consent to proposed increases of rates.

The foregoing account of what was done, and of what was considered by Congress but left undone, conveys but a partial impression of the variety of the President's activities. He was interested in the conservation of national resources and in the Panama Canal. He established many great forest reserves, and when Congress passed an act that no more such reservations should be made except by its own authority, he made an order reserving seventeen million acres just before signing the act which took away his power. He made a personal visit to Panama, and sent a message to Congress giving—with photographic illustrations—the results of his observations. He made two changes in the administration of the canal, and when an attempt to have the excavation done by contract met with failure, he entrusted the work to an army officer of engineers, with the happiest results.

It would be a hopeless task to compress within reasonable limits a statement of the other subjects discussed by the President in his many messages to Congress and in the numerous speeches made by him in the course of his tours, north, south, and west. The keynote of a large proportion of his utterances was undying hostility to the great corporations popularly termed "trusts," and to the accumulation of great wealth in individual hands. On many occasions, even in messages to Congress, he singled out the Standard Oil Company as a malefactor guilty of every possible crime against the public. It is believed that no other President except Andrew Johnson indulged so freely as did he in personalities, and even Mr. Johnson did not denounce men or bodies of men by name in his official papers. These statements are not to be taken as condemnatory of Mr. Roosevelt, but merely as statements of fact which every reader will judge for himself. Beyond all doubt his attitude toward the trusts, and toward the Standard Oil Company in particular, did him no harm with the people. A large majority of the people were of the same way of thinking and applauded him hotly. It was the popular sentiment at the time, whether permanent or not is for the future to show, to regard the great

corporations as an unmitigated evil, and the possession of enormous wealth not merely as *prima facie* evidence but as incontrovertible evidence of wrongdoing, and the existence of such fortunes as a curse which it was the first duty of statesmanship to remove. The prevalence of these sentiments, largely due to the frequent and most forcible presentation of them by the President, was one of the most important and striking features of the political thought of the time. It may be doubted whether it had any appreciable effect upon the result of the ensuing election. But it certainly rendered the task of Mr. Roosevelt's successor by no means easy.

Before entering upon the story of the canvass which culminated in the election of 1908, it is necessary to call attention to the absence — to the singular absence — of the tariff question from the discussions in Congress and from the issues of the campaign. Not that the subject was altogether absent from the thoughts of journalists and politicians. A sentiment gradually took root in the minds of many Republicans both East and West in favor of a revision of the tariff. It was coupled with a desire for the establishment of closer trade relations with Canada by means of a reciprocity treaty. Those who took this view of the matter declared themselves loyal supporters of the Republican doctrine of protection, but they held that the rates imposed by the tariff law of 1897 were too high, and that they should be reduced by a reasonable amount. They denounced those who opposed a change, and called them, as by a term of reproach, "stand-patters." The question of tariff revision entered into the local politics of several States, chiefly Iowa, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts, and led to contests between two factions for governors and congressmen. Although the President was believed to sympathize at least mildly with the revisionists, he was too earnest in securing the social reforms which he advocated to favor the taking up of the tariff question by Congress. Had he done so his effort would probably have met with failure. There were some revisionists in Congress, but the "stand-patters" had full control of both branches. There were signs, nevertheless, of great restiveness on the part of a minority, and the germs of "insurgency" which sprouted and grew to maturity during the next administration were already in good ground.

Mention must also be made of an event which at one time bade fair to be of large political importance. In August, 1906,

the town of Brownsville, Texas, was "shot up." Several companies of colored infantry were in garrison in the town, and it was charged that a party of them went through the town by night firing indiscriminately into the houses, and caused much damage to property and injury to persons. Circumstances pointed strongly to the colored soldiers as the offenders, but if they were guilty their action was so well planned in advance that it was impossible to fix the guilt upon any man or even upon the members of any company. Nevertheless there seemed to be little doubt that the guilty men were among them. When every soldier in the garrison had denied not only participation in the affair but also knowledge of the guilt of any man, the President took the radical step of discharging all the men in the companies in the garrison, "without honor," forbade their reënlistment, and declared them ineligible to any employment in a civil capacity by the government. There was a great outcry against the severity of the President's order, and the special advocates of the colored race denounced it violently. The matter was debated in Congress, particularly in the Senate, with much heat, and the order was declared to be in violation of army regulations and wholly beyond the President's power. The prohibition of civil employment was soon withdrawn, and sometime afterward those men who could prove that they were personally not concerned in the affair were permitted to reënlist. Mr. Taft, who was even then regarded as a probable candidate for the presidency, was then the Secretary of War. He stood loyally by the President in the matter, and was then and afterward warned that he would be strongly opposed by the colored voters and their friends. It does not appear that the threat was effective with those who were expected to be influenced by it.

Mr. Bryan, who had announced his purpose of devoting himself to organizing the progressive element of his party for the contest of 1908, was wise enough not to begin operations at once. He departed on a trip round the world, and received much attention in the countries which he visited. But to a somewhat unusual extent the canvass for the succession to Mr. Roosevelt was present in the minds of politicians during the whole four years of his term. Mr. Bryan, having returned to the United States in August, 1906, began to rally his adherents and the adherents of his policies. His first speech was at Madison Square Garden in New York, on the 30th of August. He

was received with much enthusiasm and outlined a part of his political programme. Among other measures he advocated government ownership of railroads, "not as an immediate issue, but as an ultimate solution of the controversy." At that time it was generally taken for granted that he would again be the candidate of his party, if he should desire the nomination. There was no other candidate in sight. Those who had endeavored in 1904 to throw off the radical yoke, and to shelve Mr. Bryan, had suffered such a defeat that they could hardly hope again to persuade the national convention to assume a conservative tone. They were fully as earnest in their opposition to Mr. Bryan as before, but were silent and hopeless. Mr. Bryan set speculation regarding his own intentions at rest in a speech in Texas, in January, 1908, in which he said: "Those of you who never had an opportunity to hear a real live President of the United States can at least say now that you have heard one speak who, on two occasions, cherished the delusion that he was going to be a real live President, and he feels the disease coming on again."

It was not yet a clear field for him. There was interest, curiosity, not to say anxiety, on the part of many Democrats who saw the gradual building-up of Mr. William R. Hearst's "Independence League." Mr. Hearst came perilously near being elected Mayor of New York City in 1906, although he was running in opposition to the regular Democratic candidate. The Independence League was universally recognized as an organization having for its sole object the promotion of the political fortunes of Mr. Hearst. It was financed by him, and was under his immediate management and control. No one but himself and his intimates — possibly even they should be excepted — knew whether he intended to contest the Democratic nomination or to set up an independent party and a separate ticket. The mystery was not solved for more than a year.

It is not to be supposed that among the regular Democrats there was no disposition to contest Mr. Bryan's supremacy. Here and there, particularly in the South, there were mutterings of discontent. Mr. Henry Watterson, of Louisville, the creator of many political sensations, announced in his paper, the "Courier-Journal," that he had found a candidate who could be nominated and elected. After a time he revealed the name of the man whom he proposed — Governor John Johnson, of Minnesota. The suggestion was well received, for Mr.

Johnson had twice been successful in his canvass for the governorship, although his State was strongly Republican. But Mr. Bryan was too well entrenched. His leadership could not be broken. Nor did the suggestion of Judge George Gray, of Delaware, of Mr. Judson Harmon, of Ohio, of Mr. Hoke Smith, of Georgia, or of other possible candidates, disturb Mr. Bryan or weaken his hold on the party.

On the Republican side there was a multiplicity of candidates. The third term idea could not be put down permanently. No one, even those who persisted in urging that Mr. Roosevelt be elected once more, questioned or doubted his sincerity and earnestness in refusing to be a candidate. They thought the Republican convention could be "stampeded," and that he might be nominated and elected in spite of himself. The President did his utmost to put a stop to the movement. But whenever it was renewed and he did not instantly reiterate his purpose, the "boomers" were encouraged. "Consider," they said in effect. "Suppose the convention does not ask him to accept another nomination. Suppose that the electors vote for him and elect him. He has n't said that he would not serve another term." Such suggestions forced the President to repeat again and again his fixed determination. In December, 1907, he gave out a statement in which, after reciting his announcement just after the election of 1904, he said: "I have not changed and shall not change the decision thus announced." Undoubtedly the movement made a deeper impression on the public mind because some of those who promoted it were in close personal and official relations to the President.

The third term "boom" did not prevent the friends of other candidates from active efforts in their behalf. Vice-President Fairbanks was strongly supported not only by his State, Indiana, but in other parts of the country. Governor Hughes, of New York, whose political career, brief but brilliant, had won for him many friends, was a favorite candidate, less with the politicians than with those who prided themselves upon their independence. The governor wrote a letter in which he intimated that he would accept a nomination if it came to him under proper conditions, and a Hughes league was formed in New York. Secretary Root was favored by many men, on account of the ability and tact he had shown in the War and State Departments; but the movement in his favor made little progress, inasmuch as opposition developed, based upon

his relations to corporate interests before he entered the field of national politics. The growing band of "insurgents," or as they were then called, "progressive" Republicans, urged the nomination of Governor Cummins, of Iowa. Then there were "favorite sons," — Senator Knox, of Pennsylvania, Governor La Follette, of Wisconsin, and Mr. Speaker Cannon, of Illinois. Finally there were those who advised politicians to keep an eye on Secretary of the Treasury George B. Cortelyou, in case the convention should come to a deadlock and the delegates should turn to a "dark horse."

But it was not difficult for any observer to discover that the President's preference in the matter of his successor was his Secretary of War, William H. Taft, who had achieved a great reputation as Governor of the Philippines and had enhanced it as a cabinet officer. It was alleged that the President used his appointing power to promote the candidacy of Judge Taft, — an accusation which he warmly repelled and challenged the citation of particulars, although he did not deny the statement that he hoped Mr. Taft would be the candidate. Senator Foraker, of Ohio, who was himself a candidate and announced his purpose to contest with Mr. Taft the election of delegates from Ohio, and who was by no means friendly to the President, openly charged improper use of the official patronage in the preliminaries of the canvass. In a speech at Canton, Ohio, in April, 1907, he said, "that the President of the United States should be engaged in a political contest to determine his successor is without a precedent, unless it be the bad precedent set by Andrew Jackson as to Martin Van Buren." It may be mentioned that when a vacancy occurred on the bench of the Supreme Court the seat was offered to Mr. Taft, and was declined by him, in view of his candidacy for the presidency, although he had a strong predilection for a judicial position. For a full year before the election Judge Taft was much before the people in many parts of the country, and made many speeches on public affairs. He was regarded, no doubt rightly, as a spokesman for the President, when the President was not speaking for himself.

The first direct steps in the canvass were taken in December, 1907, when the national committees of the two leading parties met to determine the time and place of holding the national conventions. The Republicans chose Chicago as the place and June 16, 1908, as the time of their meeting. The Democrats

fixed upon Denver, and July 7. From the time the preliminaries were agreed upon there was increased political activity. Early in January a movement was set on foot in New York City by certain Democrats,—some of them citizens of other States,—the plain purpose of which was to eliminate Mr. Bryan. It was decided to have a secret conference of chosen men, and invitations were sent to those who had been selected. But the publicity that was given to the movement killed it. The wish to be "regular" was so strong in the minds of many men that there seemed to be little hope that the conference would be generally attended. The project was given up as "premature," and the invitations were withdrawn. In fact the effort to throw aside Mr. Bryan did not prosper. In the same month of January it was noised abroad that some of the senators and congressmen had conferred together, and that one or more of them would shortly advise Mr. Bryan that it was the general opinion of Democrats that he should withdraw from the field. Mr. Bryan took a characteristic course. He went to Washington, as if to give those who were conspiring to "bell the cat" their opportunity. With one consent they refrained. Mr. Bryan's visit was a triumph. No one suggested that he should lay down the leadership. On the contrary, he went away from the city more evidently the leader of his party than ever before; and from that time there was no doubt of his nomination, and no movement against it that gave the smallest promise of success. Yet every one knew that there was a certain element in the party that had never cheerfully submitted to his leadership, and that many men who had supported him heartily either were tired of his ascendancy or doubted the expediency of nominating him for a third time. Late in 1907 there was a canvass by the New York "Times" and the Brooklyn "Eagle" of Democratic sentiment in the South where Mr. Bryan was strongest. The result indicated that, although Bryan had more supporters than any other candidate, there was much lukewarmness toward him.

On the 22d of February, 1908, there was a conference of Mr. Hearst's Independence League in Chicago. A platform was adopted, and Mr. Hearst made a speech in which he attacked both parties—the Republicans for their opposition to the policies which he advocated, the Democrats because they did not show constancy in their advocacy of those policies. It was decided that the provisional national committee should

make nominations of President and Vice-President after the conventions of the two leading parties.

No further political events of importance took place until the time for the meeting of the National Conventions. Beginning in February, there were the usual State and district conventions, which had not proceeded far before it became evident to all political observers that the nominations would fall to Mr. Taft and Mr. Bryan.

The first convention for the nomination of candidates in 1908 was that of the People's party. It was held at St. Louis on April 2 and 3. About three hundred delegates were said to be in attendance, but as was increasingly the case with the convention of that party, representation was exceedingly irregular. Some States were not represented at all; some were represented by a single person who was not always a citizen of the State for which he acted. It was asserted on the floor that a resident of St. Louis was casting the entire vote, twenty-five, of Montana. Complaint was also made that certain members of the convention were self-appointed, no convention having been held to choose delegates. The fact that such statements were made indicates that the convention was not completely harmonious; and that also is a fact. Wrangling began before the convention met. The Nebraska delegation and that — consisting of one man — from Minnesota, went to St. Louis with a demand that the convention be postponed until after the Democratic Convention should be held. Their purpose was evident. They wished to make Mr. Bryan the candidate of the party. If he should be nominated at Denver, well and good. If not, the Populists should nominate him and make inroads into the Democratic ranks. But the Nebraska men were in a hopeless minority. The "Middle-of-the-Road" policy was strongly in the ascendant. Neither before the convention met nor at any time during its sessions was the proposition to postpone brought forward without meeting with overwhelming defeat. When the convention came to the point of deciding that nominations were in order, the Nebraska and Minnesota delegations withdrew.

Jacob S. Coxey, of Ohio, was the temporary chairman of the convention and George H. Honnecker, of New Jersey, was the permanent President. The platform, which pleased the Nebraska and Bryan faction as little as did the resolution to make nominations at that time, was adopted on the 3d of April, and was as follows: —

The People's Party of the United States, with increased confidence in its contentions, reaffirms the declarations made by the national convention at Omaha.

The admonitions of Washington's farewell, the state papers of Jefferson, and the words of Lincoln are the teachings of our greatest apostles of human rights and political liberty. There has been a departure from the teachings of these great patriots during recent administrations. The government has been controlled so as to place the rights of property above the rights of humanity, has brought the country to a condition that is full of danger to our national wellbeing. Financial combinations have had too much power over Congress and too much influence with the administrative departments of the government. Prerogatives of government have been unwisely and often corruptly surrendered to corporate monopoly and aggregations of predatory wealth.

The issuing of money is a function of government and should not be delegated to corporation or individual. The Constitution gives to Congress alone the power to issue money and regulate the value thereof. We therefore demand that all money shall be issued by the government direct to the people, without the intervention of banks, and be a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and in quantities to supply the necessity of the country. We demand that postal savings banks be instituted for the savings of the people.

The public domain is the sacred heritage of all the people, and should be held for homesteads for actual settlers only. Alien ownership should be forbidden, and lands now held by aliens or by corporations which have violated the conditions of their grants should be restored to the public domain.

To prevent unjust discrimination and monopoly, the government should own and control the railroads and those public utilities which in their nature are monopolies. To perfect the postal service, the government should own and operate the general telegraph and telephone systems and provide a parcels post.

As to those trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies, we demand that those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enable them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn. Corporations, being the creatures of government, should be subjected to such governmental regulation and control as will adequately protect the public. We demand the taxation of monopoly privileges while they remain in private hands, to the extent of the value of the privilege granted.

We demand that Congress shall enact a general law uniformly regulating the powers and duties of all incorporated companies doing interstate business.

As a means of placing all public questions directly under the control of the people, we demand that legal provision be made under which the people may exercise the initiative, referendum, and proportional representation, and direct vote for all public officers, with the right of recall.

We believe in the right of those who labor to organize for their mutual protection and benefit, and encourage the efforts of the People's Party to preserve this right inviolate. We condemn the recent attempt to destroy the power of trade unions through the unjust use of the Federal injunction, substituting government by injunction for free government.

We favor the enactment of legislation looking to the improvement of conditions for wage-earners. We demand the abolition of child labor in factories and mines and the suppression of sweat shops. We oppose the use of convict labor in competition with free labor. We demand the exclusion from American shores of foreign pauper labor, imported to beat down the wages of intelligent American workingmen. We favor the eight-hour work day and legislation protecting the lives and limbs of workmen through the use of safety appliances.

We demand the enactment of an employers' liability bill within constitutional bounds. We declare against a continuation of the criminal carelessness in the operation of mines, through which thousands of miners have lost their lives to increase the dividends of stockholders, and demand the immediate adoption of precautionary measures to prevent a repetition of such horrible catastrophes.

We declare that in times of depression, when workingmen are thrown into enforced idleness, that works of public improvements should be at once inaugurated and work provided for those who cannot otherwise secure employment.

We especially emphasize the declaration of the Omaha platform that "wealth belongs to him who creates it, and every dollar taken from labor without a just equivalent is robbery."

We congratulate the farmers of the country upon the enormous growth of their splendid organizations and the good already accomplished through them, securing higher prices for farm products and better conditions generally for those engaged in agricultural pursuits. We urge the importance of maintaining these organizations and extending their power and influence.

We condemn all unwarranted assumption of authority by inferior federal courts in annulling by injunction the laws of the states, and demand legislative action by Congress which will prohibit such usurpation and will restrict to the Supreme Court of the United States the exercise of power in cases involving state legislation.

We are opposed to all gambling in futures.

We present to all people the foregoing declaration of principles and policies as our deep, earnest and abiding convictions, and now, before the country and in the name of the great moral but eternal power in the universe that makes for right thinking and right living and determines the destiny of nations, this convention pledges that the People's Party will stand by these principles and policies in success and in defeat; that never again will the party, by the siren songs and false promises of designing politicians, be tempted to change its course or be again drawn upon the treacherous rocks of fusion.

Thomas E. Watson, of Georgia, was nominated for President, and Samuel W. Williams, of Indiana, for Vice-President. Both nominations were made by acclamation.

The convention of the Socialist party was held at Chicago, May 10-17. A Socialist convention differs in many important respects from the convention of any other party. There is nothing "cut and dried" about it. From beginning to end everything is left to decision by the convention itself, after the freest sort of discussion, — for the members have no hesitation in expressing their opinions about one another as well as upon the subject under consideration. It would be impracticable, doubtless it would also be inexpedient, for a Democratic or a Republican national convention to throw its platform open to unlimited debate, paragraph by paragraph, and even word by word, as in committee of the whole. But that is the way a Socialist platform is constructed. To illustrate: The platform is in three parts, first, a declaration of "principles"; second, the "platform" proper; third, the "programme." When the "principles" were under discussion a delegate called attention to the following sentence: "They [the capitalists] select our executives, bribe our legislatures, and corrupt our courts of justice." He moved, and the convention voted, to substitute "the" for "our." The implication is obvious. Another member suggested that the words "of justice" ought to be struck out, but that was not done. When the platform was discussed, a delegate wished to make a similar change in the phrase "which our courts, legislatures, and executives," etc., and a debate ensued, in which members of the platform committee protested against a change which would imply that Socialists did not consider themselves as members of the nation, and the convention allowed the phrase to stand as given above.

That the party should choose Sunday for its day of meeting, that it should change its presiding officer every day, that it should constitute every committee by election instead of by appointment, that the delegates should address one another in debate as "Comrade" So-and-so, — all these and other points that might be mentioned are indications of the extreme independence that characterizes their conventions — an independence on which, with good reason, they pride themselves. A necessary consequence of their method is that a Socialist convention is protracted. That of 1908 lasted eight days, on each of which there were two sessions. The number of delegates probably slightly exceeded two hundred, as the largest number recorded on any roll-call was 198. Twenty or more of the number were women. Credentials were presented from forty-four States and two Territories, but it is not possible to say whether delegates were present from all those States.

The platform, in three parts, was adopted piecemeal, at several sessions. As finally agreed upon it is as follows:—

PRINCIPLES

Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

To-day the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employed workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental labor power—the wage worker—or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—the small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited, propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage-working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage-workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country's industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessities of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate reproduction for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It wantonly disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed, and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominating par-

ties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They sway our educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage-workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most vital and direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society: The small farmer, who is to-day exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within the very bosom of present capitalist society. The factory system, with its immense machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process, while the great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have had the effect of organizing the work and management of some of our main industries on a national scale, and fitting them for national use and operation.

The Socialist party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of the workers of all nations are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but

to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.

PLATFORM

The Socialist party, in national convention assembled, in entering upon the campaign of 1908, again presents itself to the people as the party of the working class, and as such it appeals for the support of all workers of the United States and of all citizens who sympathize with the great and just cause of labor.

We are at this moment in the midst of one of those industrial breakdowns that periodically paralyze the life of the nation. The much-boasted era of our national prosperity has been followed by one of general misery. Factories, mills and mines are closed. Millions of men, ready, willing and able to provide the nation with all the necessities and comforts of life are forced into idleness and starvation.

Within recent times the trusts and monopolies have attained an enormous and menacing development. They have acquired the power to dictate the terms upon which we shall be allowed to live. The trusts fix the prices of our bread, meat and sugar, of our coal, oil and clothing, of our raw material and machinery, of all the necessities of life.

The present desperate condition of the workers has been made the opportunity for a renewed onslaught on organized labor. The highest courts of the country have within the last year rendered decision after decision depriving the workers of rights which they had won by generations of struggle.

The attempt to destroy the Western Federation of Miners, although defeated by the solidarity of organized labor and the Socialist movement, revealed the existence of a far-reaching and unscrupulous conspiracy by the ruling class against the organization of labor.

In their efforts to take the lives of the leaders of the miners the conspirators violated state laws and the federal constitution in a manner seldom equaled even in a country so completely dominated by the profit-seeking class as is the United States.

The Congress of the United States has shown its contempt for the interests of labor as plainly and unmistakably as have the other branches of government. The laws for which the labor organizations have continually petitioned have failed to pass. Laws ostensibly enacted for the benefit of labor have been distorted against labor.

The working class of the United States cannot expect any remedy for its wrongs from the present ruling class or from the dominant parties. So long as a small number of individuals are

permitted to control the sources of the nation's wealth for their private profit in competition with each other and for the exploitation of their fellowmen, industrial depressions are bound to occur at certain intervals. No currency reforms or other legislative measures proposed by capitalist reformers can avail against these fatal results of utter anarchy in production.

Individually competition leads inevitably to combinations and trusts. No amount of government regulation, or of publicity, or of restrictive legislation will arrest the natural course of modern industrial development.

While our courts, legislatures and executive offices remain in the hands of the ruling classes and their agents, the government will be used in the interests of these classes as against the toilers.

Political parties are but the expression of economic class interests. The Republican, the Democratic, and the so-called "Independence" parties and all parties other than the Socialist party, are financed, directed and controlled by the representatives of different groups of the ruling class.

In the maintenance of class government both the Democratic and Republican parties have been equally guilty. The Republican party has had control of the national government and has been directly and actively responsible for these wrongs. The Democratic party, while saved from direct responsibility by its political impotence, has shown itself equally subservient to the aims of the capitalist class whenever and wherever it has been in power. The old chattel slave-owning aristocracy of the south, which was the backbone of the Democratic party, has been supplanted by a child slave plutocracy. In the great cities of our country the Democratic party is allied with the criminal element of the slums as the Republican party is allied with the predatory criminals of the palace in maintaining the interests of the possessing class.

The various "reform" movements and parties which have sprung up within recent years are but the clumsy expression of widespread popular discontent. They are not based on an intelligent understanding of the historical development of civilization and of the economic and political needs of our time. They are bound to perish as the numerous middle class reform movements of the past have perished.

PROGRAMME

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following programme:—

1. The immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building schools, by reforesting of cutover and waste lands, by reclamation of arid tracts, and the building of canals, and by extending all other useful public works. All persons employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight-hour work-day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works. It shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

2. The collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamship lines and all other means of social transportation and communication, and all land.

3. The collective ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

4. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water-power.

5. The scientific reforestation of timber lands, and the reclamation of swamp lands. The land so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain.

6. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

7. The improvement of the industrial condition of the workers,

(a) By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

(c) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops and factories.

(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories.

(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accident, invalidism, old age and death.

8. The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

9. A graduated income tax.

10. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

11. The initiative and referendum, proportional representation and the right of recall.

12. The abolition of the senate.

13. The abolition of the power usurped by the supreme court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people.

14. That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

15. The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health. The bureau of education to be made a department. The creation of a department of public health.

16. The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor, and the establishment of a department of labor.

17. That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions shall be curbed by immediate legislation.

18. The free administration of justice.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

On May 14 Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana, was nominated as the Socialist candidate for President on the first roll-call. The full vote was as follows :—

Whole vote cast	198
For Eugene V. Debs, of Indiana	159
For James F. Carey, of Massachusetts	16
For Carl D. Thompson, of Wisconsin	14
For A. M. Simons, of Illinois	9

The nomination was then made unanimous.

The vote for a candidate for Vice-President was as follows :—

Whole vote cast	185
For Benjamin Hanford, of New York	106
For Seymour Stedman, of Illinois	42
For May Wood Simons, of Illinois	20
For John W. Slayton, of Pennsylvania	15
For Caleb Lipscomb, of Missouri	1
For G. W. Woodby, of California	1

The nomination of Mr. Hanford was also made unanimous. It is an interesting fact that with the exception of Mr. Debs

every person voted for as a candidate for either President or Vice-President was an active member of the convention; also that one of the persons voted for as a candidate for Vice-President was the wife of one who received votes as a candidate for President.

The Republican National Convention was held at Chicago on June 16. Julius C. Burroughs, of Michigan, was the temporary chairman, and Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, was the permanent president.

Although the nomination of Judge Taft was practically assured, the proceedings of the convention did not lack interest. The friends of other candidates refused to give up hope. They were encouraged — not to a great extent, to be sure — by a certain opposition to Taft inspired by a feeling that he was too closely identified with, and too strongly committed to, the Roosevelt policies. For there was a contingent of the delegates who were not radical in their opinions. But the shadow of Roosevelt covered the convention; and neither the conservatives nor those who were not so much opposed to Taft as favorable to other candidates, when the two bodies were united, could emerge from that shadow. There was a certain amount of concerted action by the advocates of Fairbanks, Hughes, and Cannon, who were known as "the allies." They were not merely a minority, in the end they were not a united minority.

Prior to the meeting of the convention the National Committee took up the matter of contested seats. Most of the contests were of a frivolous nature; a few had some basis. The decisions of the committee were almost uniformly in favor of the "regular" delegates, who were committed to Taft. There is no reason to think that the decisions were wrong, or even doubtful, although the ways of Republican conventions in the Southern States, whence nearly all the contests arose, are not always strictly fair and praiseworthy. The friends of candidates whose contesting delegates were rejected at first declared their purpose of carrying the matter before the full convention, but ultimately they recognized the hopelessness of such a step, and refrained.

There were of course differences over the platform, for the conservatives were not disposed to surrender their principles. The controversy, such as it was, came upon what was known

as the "anti-injunction" plank. The term was a misnomer, for it was not proposed to forbid injunctions in labor disputes, but to urge certain restrictions upon the issuance of writs of injunction. As it was finally adopted by probably two thirds of the Committee on Resolutions, it was not a particularly vigorous paragraph, but it was said to embody the views of Mr. Taft and the President, and was adopted on that account. The opposition was not directed so much against the principle stated, as against the recognition of the principle as a political issue.

As was expected, there was an attempt to stampede the convention for Roosevelt, but if such a movement ever had a chance of success, that chance was thrown away prematurely. Senator Lodge, in his speech on taking the chair as President, made a most complimentary allusion to the President as "the best abused and the most popular man in the United States to-day." Vigorous applause greeted the remark, and the applause was quickly taken up by the throngs in the galleries. It did not cease, but was continued long after the delegates had quieted down. Still it continued. Whether the galleries were "packed" in any other sense than that of being uncomfortably full, no one knows. Possibly the crowd was carried away by its own enthusiasm, born at the moment. Probably not one person in ten who applauded had heard distinctly the words he was cheering. At all events, the din lasted forty-six minutes. It had no effect upon the delegates. They had gone to Chicago to nominate Taft, and were not to be moved from their purpose by a gallery demonstration which might be spontaneous — and might not be.

The platform was reported on the third day of the convention, June 19, and after a discussion of unusual length was adopted. It was as follows: —

Once more the Republican party, in national convention assembled, submits its cause to the people. This great historic organization that destroyed slavery, preserved the Union, restored credit, expanded the national domain, established a sound financial system, developed the industries and resources of the country, and gave to the nation her seat of honor in the councils of the world, now meets the new problems of government with the same courage and capacity with which it solved the old.

In this the great era of American advancement the Republican party has reached its highest service under the leadership of

Theodore Roosevelt. His administration is an epoch in American history. In no other period since national sovereignty was won under Washington, or preserved under Lincoln, has there been such mighty progress in those ideals of government which make for justice, equality, and fair dealing among men. The highest aspirations of the American people have found a voice. Their most exalted servant represents the best aims and worthiest purposes of all his countrymen. American manhood has been lifted to a nobler sense of duty and obligation. Conscience and courage in public station, and higher standards of right and wrong in private life have become cardinal principles of political faith; capital and labor have been brought into closer relations of confidence and interdependence, and the abuse of wealth, the tyranny of power, and all the evils of privilege and favoritism have been put to scorn by the simple, manly virtues of justice and fair play.

The great accomplishments of President Roosevelt have been, first and foremost, a brave and impartial enforcement of the law, the prosecution of illegal trusts and monopolies, the exposure and punishment of evildoers in the public service, the more effective regulation of the rates and service of the great transportation lines, the complete overthrow of preferences, rebates, and discriminations, the arbitration of labor disputes, the amelioration of the condition of wage-workers everywhere, the conservation of the natural resources of the country, the forward step in the improvement of the inland waterways, and always the earnest support and defence of every wholesome safeguard which has made more secure the guarantees of life, liberty, and property.

These are the achievements that will make for Theodore Roosevelt his place in history, but more than all else the great things he has done will be an inspiration to those who have yet greater things to do. We declare our unfaltering adherence to the policies thus inaugurated, and pledge their continuance under a Republican administration of the government.

Under the guidance of Republican principles the American people have become the richest nation in the world. Our wealth today exceeds that of England and all her colonies, and that of France and Germany combined. When the Republican party was born, the total wealth of the country was \$16,000,000,000. It has leaped to \$110,000,000,000 in a generation, while Great Britain has gathered but \$60,000,000,000 in five hundred years. The United States now owns one fourth of the world's wealth and makes one third of all modern manufactured products. In the great necessities of civilization, such as coal, the motive power of all activity; iron, the chief basis of all industry; cotton, the staple foundation of all fabrics; wheat, corn, and all the agricultural products that feed

mankind, America's supremacy is undisputed. And yet her great natural wealth has been scarcely touched. We have a vast domain of 3,000,000 square miles, literally bursting with latent treasure, still waiting the magic of capital and industry to be converted to the practical uses of mankind; a country rich in soil and climate, in the unharnessed energy of its rivers, and in all the varied products of the field, the forest, and the factory. With gratitude for God's bounty, with pride in the splendid productiveness of the past, and with confidence in the plenty and prosperity of the future, the Republican party declares for the principle that in the development and enjoyment of wealth so great and blessings so benign there shall be equal opportunity for all.

Nothing so clearly demonstrates the sound basis upon which our commercial, industrial, and agricultural interests are founded, and the necessity of promoting their continued welfare through the operation of Republican policies as the recent safe passage of the American people through a financial disturbance which, if appearing in the midst of Democratic rule or the menace of it, might have equalled the familiar Democratic panics of the past. We congratulate the people upon the renewed evidence of American supremacy, and hail with confidence the signs now manifest of a complete restoration of business prosperity in all lines of trade, commerce, and manufacturing.

Since the election of William McKinley, in 1896, the people of this country have felt anew the wisdom of intrusting to the Republican party, through decisive majorities, the control and direction of national legislation. The many wise and progressive measures adopted at recent sessions of Congress have demonstrated the patriotic resolve of Republican leadership in the legislative department to keep step in the forward march toward better government. Notwithstanding the indefensible filibustering of a Democratic minority in the House of Representatives during the last session, many wholesome and progressive laws were enacted, and we especially commend the passage of the emergency currency bill; the appointment of the national monetary commission; the employers' and government liability laws; the measures for the greater efficiency of the army and navy; the widows' pension bill; the child labor law for the District of Columbia; the new statutes for the safety of railroad engineers and firemen; and many other acts conserving the public welfare.

✓ The Republican party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President, and commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation

and effect of existing schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries. We favor the establishment of maximum and minimum rates to be administered by the President under limitations fixed by the law, the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets, and the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home; the aim and purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, that security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-earners of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system. Between the United States and the Philippines we believe in a free interchange of products with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests.

We approve the emergency measures adopted by the government during the recent financial disturbance, and especially commend the passage by Congress, at the last session, of the law designed to protect the country from a repetition of such stringency. The Republican party is committed to the development of a permanent currency system, responding to our greater needs, and the appointment of the national monetary commission by the present Congress, which will impartially investigate all proposed methods, insures the early realization of this purpose. The present currency laws have fully justified their adoption, but an expanding commerce, a marvellous growth in wealth and population, multiplying the centres of distribution, increasing the demand for the movement of crops in the West and South and entailing periodic changes in monetary conditions, disclose the need of a more elastic and adaptable system. Such a system must meet the requirements of agriculturists, manufacturers, merchants, and business men generally, must be automatic in operation, minimizing the fluctuations in interest rates, and above all, must be in harmony with that Republican doctrine which insists that every dollar shall be based upon and as good as gold.

We favor the establishment of a postal savings bank system for the convenience of the people and the encouragement of thrift.

The Republican party passed the Sherman anti-trust law over Democratic opposition, and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. It has been a wholesome instrument for good in the hands of a wise and fearless administration. But experience has shown that its effectiveness can be strengthened and its real objects better

attained by such amendments as will give to the federal government greater supervision and control over, and secure greater publicity in, the management of that class of corporations engaged in interstate commerce having power and opportunity to effect monopolies.

We approve the enactment of the railroad rate law and the vigorous enforcement by the present administration of the statutes against rebates and discriminations, as a result of which the advantages formerly possessed by the large shipper over the small shipper have substantially disappeared; and in this connection we commend the appropriation by the present Congress to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to thoroughly investigate, and give publicity to, the accounts of interstate railroads. We believe, however, that the interstate commerce law should be further amended so as to give railroads the right to make and publish traffic agreements subject to the approval of the commission, but maintaining always the principle of competition between naturally competing lines and avoiding the common control of such lines by any means whatsoever. We favor such national legislation and supervision as will prevent the future overissue of stocks and bonds by interstate carriers.

The enactment in constitutional form at the present session of Congress of the employers' liability law, the passage and enforcement of the safety appliance statutes, as well as the additional protection secured for engineers and firemen; the reduction in the hours of labor of trainmen and railroad telegraphers, the successful exercise of the powers of mediation and arbitration between interstate railroads and their employes, and the law making a beginning in the policy of compensation for injured employes of the government, are among the most commendable accomplishments of the present administration. But there is further work in this direction yet to be done, and the Republican party pledges its continued devotion to every cause that makes for safety and the betterment of conditions among those whose labor contributes so much to the progress and welfare of the country.

The same wise policy which has induced the Republican party to maintain protection to American labor, to establish an eight-hour day in the construction of all public works, to increase the list of employes who shall have preferred claims for wages under the bankruptcy laws, to adopt a child labor statute for the District of Columbia, to direct an investigation into the condition of working women and children, and, later, of employes of telephone and telegraph companies engaged in interstate business; to appropriate \$150,000 at the recent session of Congress in order to secure a thorough inquiry into the causes of catastrophes and loss of life

in the mines, and to amend and strengthen the law prohibiting the importation of contract labor, will be pursued in every legitimate direction within federal authority to lighten the burdens and increase the opportunity for happiness and advancement of all who toil. The Republican party recognizes the special needs of wage-workers generally, for their well-being means the well-being of all. But more important than all other considerations is that of good citizenship, and we especially stand for the needs of every American, whatever his occupation, in his capacity as a self-respecting citizen.

The Republican party will uphold at all times the authority and integrity of the courts, state and federal, and will ever insist that their powers to enforce their process and to protect life, liberty and property shall be preserved inviolate. We believe, however, that the rules of procedure in the federal courts with respect to the issuance of the writ of injunction should be more accurately defined by statute, and that no injunction or temporary restraining order should be issued without notice, except where irreparable injury would result from delay, in which case a speedy hearing thereafter should be granted.

Among those whose welfare is as vital to the welfare of the whole country as is that of the wage-earner is the American farmer. The prosperity of the country rests peculiarly upon the prosperity of agriculture. The Republican party during the last twelve years has accomplished extraordinary work in bringing the resources of the national government to the aid of the farmer, not only in advancing agriculture itself, but in increasing the conveniences of rural life. Free rural mail delivery has been established; it now reaches millions of our citizens, and we favor its extension until every community in the land receives the full benefits of the postal service. We recognize the social and economic advantages of good country roads, maintained more and more largely at public expense and less and less at the expense of the abutting owner. In this work we commend the growing practice of state aid, and we approve the efforts of the national Agricultural Department by experiments and otherwise to make clear to the public the best methods of road construction.

The Republican party has been for more than fifty years the consistent friend of the American negro. It gave him freedom and citizenship. It wrote into the organic law the declarations that proclaim his civil and political rights, and it believes to-day that his noteworthy progress in intelligence, industry, and good citizenship has earned the respect and encouragement of the nation. We demand equal justice for all men, without regard to race or color; we declare once more, and without reservation, for the enforcement

in letter and spirit of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, which were designed for the protection and advancement of the negro, and we condemn all devices that have for their real aim his disfranchisement for reasons of color alone, as unfair, un-American, and repugnant to the supreme law of the land.

We indorse the movement inaugurated by the administration for the conservation of natural resources; we approve all measures to prevent the waste of timber; we commend the work now going on for the reclamation of arid lands, and reaffirm the Republican policy of the free distribution of the available areas of the public domain to the landless settler. No obligation of the future is more insistent, and none will result in greater blessings to posterity. In line with this splendid undertaking is the further duty, equally imperative, to enter upon a systematic improvement upon a large and comprehensive plan, just to all portions of the country, of the waterways, harbors, and Great Lakes, whose natural adaptability to the increasing traffic of the land is one of the greatest gifts of a benign Providence.

The present Congress passed many commendable acts increasing the efficiency of the army and navy; making the militia of the states an integral part of the national establishment; authorizing joint manœuvres of army and militia; fortifying new naval bases and completing the construction of coaling stations; instituting a female nurse corps for naval hospitals and ships, and adding two new battleships, ten torpedo boat destroyers, three steam colliers and eight submarines to the strength of the navy. Although at peace with all the world, and secure in the consciousness that the American people do not desire and will not provoke a war with any other country, we nevertheless declare our unalterable devotion to a policy that will keep this Republic ready at all times to defend her traditional doctrines, and assure her appropriate part in promoting permanent tranquillity among the nations.

We commend the vigorous efforts made by the administration to protect American citizens in foreign lands, and pledge ourselves to insist on the just and equal protection of all our citizens abroad. It is the unquestioned duty of the government to procure for all our citizens, without distinction, the rights of travel and sojourn in friendly countries, and we declare ourselves in favor of all proper efforts tending to that end.

Under the administration of the Republican party, the foreign commerce of the United States has experienced a remarkable growth, until it has a present annual valuation of approximately \$3,000,000,000, and gives employment to a vast amount of labor and capital which would otherwise be idle. It has inaugurated through

the recent visit of the Secretary of State to South America and Mexico a new era of Pan-American commerce and comity which is bringing us into closer touch with our twenty sister American republics, having a common historical heritage, a republican form of government, and offering us a limitless field of legitimate commercial expansion.

The conspicuous contributions of American statesmanship to the great cause of international peace so signally advanced in the Hague conferences, are an occasion for just pride and gratification. At the last session of the Senate of the United States eleven Hague conventions were ratified, establishing the rights of neutrals, laws of war on land, restriction of submarine mines, limiting the use of force for the collection of contractual debts, governing the opening of hostilities, extending the application of Geneva principles, and in many ways lessening the evils of war and promoting the peaceful settlement of international controversies. At the same session twelve arbitration conventions with great nations were confirmed, and extradition, boundary, and neutralization treaties of supreme importance were ratified. We indorse such achievements as the highest duty a people can perform, and proclaim the obligation of further strengthening the bonds of friendship and good-will with all the nations of the world.

We adhere to the Republican doctrine of encouragement to American shipping, and urge such legislation as will revive the merchant marine prestige of the country, so essential to national defence, the enlargement of foreign trade, and the industrial prosperity of our own people.

Another Republican policy which must ever be maintained is that of generous provision for those who have fought the country's battles, and for the widows and orphans of those who have fallen. We commend the increase in the widows' pensions, made by the present Congress, and declare for a liberal administration of all pension laws, to the end that the people's gratitude may grow deeper as the memories of heroic sacrifice grow more sacred with the passing years.

We reaffirm our declarations that the Civil Service laws, enacted, extended, and enforced by the Republican party, shall continue to be maintained and obeyed.

We commend the efforts designed to secure greater efficiency in national public health agencies, and favor such legislation as will effect this purpose.

In the interest of the great mineral industries of our country, we earnestly favor the establishment of a bureau of mines and mining.

The American government, in Republican hands, has freed Cuba, given peace and protection to Porto Rico and the Philip-

pires under our flag, and begun the construction of the Panama Canal. The present conditions in Cuba vindicate the wisdom of maintaining between that republic and this imperishable bonds of mutual interest, and the hope is now expressed that the Cuban people will soon again be ready to assume complete sovereignty over their land.

In Porto Rico the government of the United States is meeting loyal and patriotic support; order and prosperity prevail, and the well-being of the people is in every respect promoted and conserved.

We believe that the native inhabitants of Porto Rico should be at once collectively made citizens of the United States, and that all others properly qualified under existing laws residing in said island should have the privilege of becoming naturalized.

In the Philippines insurrection has been suppressed, law is established, and life and property are made secure. Education and practical experience are there advancing the capacity of the people for government, and the policies of McKinley and Roosevelt are leading the inhabitants step by step to an ever increasing measure of home rule.

Time has justified the selection of the Panama route for the great isthmian canal, and events have shown the wisdom of securing authority over the zone through which it is to be built. The work is now progressing with a rapidity far beyond expectation, and already the realization of the hopes of centuries has come within the vision of the near future.

We favor the immediate admission of the territories of New Mexico and Arizona as separate states in the Union.

February 12, 1909, will be the 100th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, an immortal spirit, whose fame has brightened with the receding years, and whose name stands among the first of those given to the world by the great republic. We recommend that this centennial anniversary be celebrated throughout the confines of the nation by all the people thereof, and especially by the public schools as an exercise to stir the patriotism of the youth of the land.

We call the attention of the American people to the fact that none of the great measures here advocated by the Republican party could be enacted, and none of the steps forward here proposed could be taken under a Democratic administration or under one in which party responsibility is divided. The continuance of present policies, therefore, absolutely requires the continuance in power of that party which believes in them and which possesses the capacity to put them into operation.

Beyond all platform declarations there are fundamental differences between the Republican party and its chief opponent which

make the one worthy and the other unworthy of public trust. In history the difference between Democracy and Republicanism is that the one stood for debased currency, the other for honest currency; the one for free silver, the other for sound money; the one for free trade, the other for protection; the one for the contraction of American influence, the other for its expansion; the one has been forced to abandon every position taken on the great issues before the people, the other has held and vindicated all.

In experience the difference between Democracy and Republicanism is that one means adversity, while the other means prosperity; one means low wages, the other means high; one means doubt and debt, the other means confidence and thrift.

In principle the difference between Democracy and Republicanism is that one stands for vacillation and timidity in government, the other for strength and purpose; one stands for obstruction, the other for construction; one promises, the other performs; one finds fault, the other finds work.

The present tendencies of the two parties are even more marked by inherent differences. The trend of Democracy is toward socialism, while the Republican party stands for wise and regulated individualism. Socialism would destroy wealth, Republicanism would prevent its abuse. Socialism would give to each an equal right to take; Republicanism would give to each an equal right to earn. Socialism would offer an equality of possession, which would soon leave no one anything to possess; Republicanism would give equality of opportunity, which would assure to each his share of a constantly increasing sum of possessions. In line with this tendency the Democratic party of to-day believes in government ownership, while the Republican party believes in government regulation. Ultimately Democracy would have the nation own the people, while Republicanism would have the people own the nation.

Upon this platform of principles and purposes, reaffirming our adherence to every Republican doctrine proclaimed since the birth of the party, we go before the country, asking the support not only of those who have acted with us heretofore, but of all our fellow citizens who, regardless of past political differences, unite in the desire to maintain the policies, perpetuate the blessings, and make secure the achievements of a greater America.

A minority report was submitted by Mr. Cooper, of Wisconsin, the only member of the Committee on Resolutions who dissented from the platform. He was a representative of the views of Governor La Follette, who had succeeded in bringing the Republican party of Wisconsin to the support of a radical policy — radical, that is, in comparison with the gen-

eral body of opinion in the party, and even more radical than the position of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Cooper proposed substitutes for many of the paragraphs in the majority report, and additional paragraphs on subjects not mentioned in that report. The minority report thus expressed dissent on the planks relating to the tariff, to the "trusts," to the regulation of railroad rates, and to the issuance of injunctions in labor cases, and it advocated a law requiring the publicity of campaign expenses, the physical valuation of railroads, an eight-hour law for all persons employed on public works, and the election of United States Senators by direct popular vote. After Mr. Cooper had advocated his minority report, a vote was taken on the substitute with the exception of these reserved paragraphs, and the substitute was rejected, ayes 28, noes 952. Twenty-five of the affirmative votes were given by Wisconsin. The paragraph relating to the publicity of campaign expenses was rejected, ayes 94, nays 880. That relating to the physical valuation of railroads was rejected, ayes 63, noes 917. That relating to the election of senators was rejected, ayes 114, noes 866. The platform as a whole was then adopted by a *viva voce* vote, with apparent although of course not absolute unanimity.

Nominations for the office of President were next in order, and the names of Mr. Cannon, Mr. Fairbanks, Secretary Taft, Governor Hughes, Mr. Foraker, and Mr. La Follette were presented, with the usual demonstrations by the partisans of each. But that demonstration was varied when the name of Governor La Follette was presented. One of the persons in the assemblage held up a large portrait of the President, and immediately there was an outburst of applause which was long continued, even after the sergeant-at-arms had required the portrait to be taken down. Then a man in the gallery unfurled a large flag bearing a portrait of Mr. Roosevelt, and the uproar became greater than ever. Mr. Lodge directed the roll of States to be called, and roll-call began in the midst of the turmoil. The second attempt to stampede the convention failed.

Mr. Taft was nominated on the first roll-call. The vote stood thus : —

Whole number voting	979
Necessary to a choice	490
William H. Taft, of Ohio	702
Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania	68

Charles E. Hughes, of New York	67
Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois	58
Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana	40
Robert E. La Follette, of Wisconsin	25
Joseph B. Foraker, of Ohio	16
Theodore Roosevelt, of New York	3

Mr. Taft had at least one vote from every State and Territory except Indiana, which cast its full vote for Mr. Fairbanks, who had ten scattering votes from other States. Most of the other candidates received votes chiefly as "favorite sons." Thus Mr. Knox had only four votes from outside of Pennsylvania; Mr. Hughes only two from outside of New York; Mr. Cannon but seven from States other than Illinois; and Mr. La Follette's votes came from Wisconsin only. Save four votes for Mr. Foraker from Ohio, the rest were given by Southern delegates. Three Pennsylvanians gave Mr. Roosevelt their votes. The nomination of Mr. Taft was made unanimous.

The nomination of a candidate for Vice-President was made on the fourth day of the convention. As the choice of Mr. Taft was assured long before the convention met, there was much canvassing by the friends of several candidates for the vice-presidency. Efforts were made to induce Mr. Fairbanks again to accept the second place on the ticket, but he steadfastly refused. There was also a strong movement to nominate Governor Hughes, when his candidacy for the first place was seen to be hopeless, but he also declined peremptorily. The first roll-call resulted as follows: —

Whole number voting	980
Necessary to a choice	491
James S. Sherman, of New York	816
Franklin Murphy, of New Jersey	77
Curtis Guild, Jr., of Massachusetts	75
George L. Sheldon, of Nebraska	16
Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana	1

The nomination of Mr. Sherman was made unanimous, and the convention adjourned.

The Socialist Labor Convention was held at New York, July 2. Twelve States were represented, and the number of delegates was twenty-three. E. Passams, of New York, was the permanent chairman, although he was elected and reelected day by day. On the first day of the convention a delegate from

a local Socialist Club was received, who urged the convention to indorse the nomination of Mr. Debs. There was a long discussion of the proposition, which no member of the convention supported, and in the end it was unanimously rejected. Two days were occupied in the determination of various matters concerning the policy of the party and in debate on propositions to amend its constitution. On the 5th of July the platform was adopted. Inasmuch as it was the platform of 1904 without any change whatever, it is omitted here.¹ When the nomination of candidates was in order, Mr. Daniel De Leon presented the name of Martin B. Preston, of Nevada, as candidate for the office of President. The only reason for the selection which he gave was that Mr. Preston, when acting as "picket" for his labor union in a time of strike, had killed a man who opposed him, for which deed he was convicted and sentenced to a term of twenty-five years' imprisonment in the Nevada State prison. In 1908 he had completed three years of the term. Mr. De Leon also remarked that Preston was ten years under the constitutional age for holding the office, but he predicted that if he were elected he would be allowed to enter upon the duties of the office. The report of the convention in the official organ of the party says that the nomination was unanimously approved "with indescribable enthusiasm." The business of the convention was completed by the nomination of Donald L. Munro, of Virginia, as a candidate for Vice-President. In consequence of the ineligibility of the candidate for President, August Gilhaus, of New York, was afterward placed at the head of the ticket.

The Democratic Convention was held, July 7-10, at Denver, the most western point at which a national political convention has been held. Both the preliminaries and the proceedings of the Convention were of unusual interest. Theodore A. Bell, of Colorado, was the temporary chairman, and Henry D. Clayton of Alabama, the permanent president.

Although the nomination of Mr. Bryan was as fully assured as any future event could be, there was earnest and even violent opposition to him by the conservative element, represented by the supporters of Judge Gray, of Delaware, and of Governor Johnson, of Minnesota. They hoped against hope. They urged that Mr. Bryan had less than the necessary two thirds

¹ See page 112.

of pledged delegates, that Mr. Bryan could not be elected, and that when the first vote should show him to have less than the requisite majority, the delegates would turn to one or the other of the opposing candidates. Although they put forward the argument with confidence and pertinacity, they allowed doubters to suspect that confidence by suggesting ever and anon that if Mr. Bryan should be chosen it would be well to balance the ticket by placing either Judge Gray or Governor Johnson upon it as the candidate for the second place. But both those gentlemen refused in the most emphatic terms to be considered for the vice-presidency, and were forced by the persistence of their advocates to repeat the refusal, time and again.

The issue, so far as the nomination of Mr. Bryan was concerned, was so generally taken for granted that most of the leading delegates, and large numbers of the rank and file, made the journey westward by way of Lincoln, Nebraska, Mr. Bryan's home, and consulted with him about the other matters to be considered by the convention. It was recognized as altogether desirable that both his "running mate" and the declaration of principles in the platform should be thoroughly acceptable to him. In the end this was effected. The language of the platform on points about which there was some controversy, was submitted to him before being read to the convention, and he is understood to have indicated his choice of the candidate ultimately selected for the vice-presidency.

Several days before the opening of the convention, while the delegates were gathering at Denver, an angry controversy broke out over a proposition to pass a resolution laudatory of President Cleveland, whose death occurred on June 24, a fortnight before the meeting of the convention. Judge Parker, who had been the candidate of the party in 1904, let it be known that he had prepared such a resolution, which was to be offered at the close of the first day's session. The text of the resolution was published and excited the liveliest indignation of the supporters of Mr. Bryan, for the statements it contained that Mr. Cleveland "respected the integrity of the courts," and "maintained the public credit, and stood firm as a rock in defence of sound principles of finance," were regarded as open attacks upon Mr. Bryan and his attitude on two matters of public policy. Judge Parker denied that he had any purpose of assailing Mr. Bryan, but those in control of affairs took the very proper position that phrases capable of

bearing the interpretation Mr. Bryan's friends put upon them, should not appear in a resolution to be considered by the convention. They therefore determined that an unobjectionable resolution should be prepared and presented by some person other than Judge Parker. The plan was carried out. When the resolution was offered on the first day of the Convention, Judge Parker was called to his feet by cries from delegates, and read a mild and inoffensive draft which he had intended to offer, if the chairman had recognized him, but he did not offer it and contented himself with seconding that already before the Convention, which was unanimously adopted.

Three most important matters caused great and prolonged discussion both without and within the convention: the vice-presidency, the decision as to contested seats, and the platform. There were receptive candidates for the second place on the ticket from a dozen or more of the States, beside the two obdurately non-receptive candidates already named, who were nevertheless urged with unyielding persistence. But the controversy over that nomination gradually died out as it became universally admitted that the final choice must be made by Mr. Bryan himself.

The contested seats were many. Idaho sent two sets of delegates, — one "anti-Mormon," — the other, of course, not "Mormon," but opposed to the programme of the "anti-Mormon" set. There was a contest in Illinois which involved a question of the leadership of the party in the State. Similarly a contest over the delegates from the districts in Brooklyn, New York, was really between Tammany Hall and the local leader. The most interesting of all were contests in Pennsylvania, where the leadership of Colonel J. M. Guffey was at stake. There had been and still was a violent personal controversy between Mr. Bryan and Col. Guffey. The National Committee, as was customary, heard the parties to the several contests and made the preliminary roll of the convention, but the committee on credentials devoted no less than seventeen hours to hearing and determining the contests. In two of the cases the committee, and the convention which adopted its conclusions, seem to have taken the wish of a majority of the delegates, and consulted Mr. Bryan's interests, rather than regarded the facts of the election, as their guide. At all events, Tammany was victorious in the Brooklyn case, and Colonel Guffey's delegates were excluded. If less than justice was done in these

cases, the same thing may be said of a long series of unjust decisions of contested seats in Congress and in every State Legislature. And after all no result was changed by the decisions.

A much more important matter required to be decided outside the convention proper. The platform of a party is usually accepted without discussion upon being reported by the Committee on Resolutions. From a party point of view it is extremely desirable that it should be so. It is of course a pure fiction that a platform expresses the opinions of all members of the party which adopts it, even upon the "paramount" issues of the day. Multitudes of free silver men voted for McKinley in 1896, and other multitudes of gold standard men supported Bryan. Nevertheless it is a recognized principle of party strategy to construct platforms in such a way as to avoid alienating a large body of voters, to employ language just strong enough and just vague enough to satisfy both factions in cases where there is a division of sentiment, and above all to avert the catastrophe of a revelation of division by having the controversy brought upon the floor of the convention. There was a serious contest in the Denver convention, as there had been in the Republican convention at Chicago, over the attitude of the party toward injunctions in cases arising out of labor disputes. It was confidently announced prior to the assembling of the delegates that the platform would follow closely the phraseology of the resolutions adopted in March, 1908, by the Nebraska Democratic State convention, which were understood to represent Mr. Bryan's personal views. The salient points of the declaration were a demand that in all such cases writs of injunction should not issue except after notice to the defendants and a hearing; that trial for contempt might be taken by another judge than the one who issued the injunction; and that there should be a trial by jury when the alleged contempt was committed not in the presence of the court. Representatives of organized labor were in attendance urging the adoption of the foregoing or even stronger language; and there was strenuous opposition. As will be seen the resolution ultimately agreed upon was quite different in form from the Nebraska platform, but all parties expressed themselves as satisfied.

There were few incidents of the convention proceedings that call for notice. Mention of the name of Mr. Bryan by Senator

Gore, of Oklahoma, was followed by applause which lasted eighty-seven minutes, substantially twice as long as the Roosevelt demonstration at Chicago, and much the longest cheer ever heard in a national convention. The platform committee was so long a time engaged in completing its work, that at the evening session of Thursday, the 9th, the nominating speeches for a candidate for the presidency were made before the platform was reported.¹ Mr. Bryan, Judge Gray, and Governor Johnson were placed in nomination. There was another full hour of applause when Mr. Bryan was named by Mr. Dunn, of Nebraska, who made the nominating speech.

The Committee on Resolutions reported at midnight. The reading of the platform occupied nearly an hour. The platform was unanimously adopted as follows:—

— We, the representatives of the Democrats of the United States, in national convention assembled, reaffirm our belief in, and pledge our loyalty to, the principles of the party.

We rejoice at the increasing signs of an awakening throughout the country. The various investigations have traced graft and political corruption to the representatives of predatory wealth, and laid bare the unscrupulous methods by which they have debauched elections and preyed upon a defenceless public through the subservient officials whom they have raised to place and power.

The conscience of the nation is now aroused to free the government from the grip of those who have made it a business asset of the favor-seeking corporations; it must become again a people's government, and be administered in all its departments according to the Jeffersonian maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

"Shall the people rule?" is the overshadowing issue which manifests itself in all the questions now under discussion.

The Republican Congress in session just ended has made appropriations amounting to \$1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditures of the last fiscal year by \$90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year. We denounce the needless waste of the people's money which has resulted in this appalling increase as a shameful violation of all prudent conditions of government, as no less than a crime against the millions of working men and women, from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. It is not surprising that, in the

¹ Although the official report of the convention, in book form, represents that the platform was presented and adopted before the nominating speeches were made.

face of this shocking record, the Republican platform contains no reference to economical administration or promise thereof in the future. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance, and insist upon the strictest economy in every department compatible with frugal and efficient administration.

Coincident with the enormous increase in expenditures is a like addition to the number of officeholders. During the last year 23,784 were added, costing \$16,156,000, and in the last six years of the Republican administration the total number of new offices created, aside from many commissions, has been 99,319, entailing an additional expenditure of nearly \$70,000,000, as against only 10,279 new offices created under the Cleveland and McKinley administrations, which involved an expenditure of only \$6,000,000. We denounce this great and growing increase in the number of officeholders as not only unnecessary and wasteful, but also as clearly indicating a deliberate purpose on the part of the Administration to keep the Republican party in power at public expense by thus increasing the number of its retainers and dependents. Such procedure we declare to be no less dangerous and corrupt than the open purchase of votes at the polls.

The House of Representatives was designed by the fathers of the Constitution to be the popular branch of our government, responsive to the public will.

The House of Representatives, as controlled in recent years by the Republican party, has ceased to be a deliberative and executive body, responsive to the will of a majority of its members, but has come under the absolute domination of the Speaker, who has entire control of its deliberations and powers of legislation.

We have observed with amazement the popular branch of our federal government helpless to obtain either the consideration or enactment of measures desired by a majority of its members.

Legislative government becomes a failure when one member, in the person of the Speaker, is more powerful than the entire body.

We demand that the House of Representatives shall again become a deliberative body, controlled by a majority of the people's representatives and not by the Speaker, and we pledge ourselves to adopt such rules and regulations to govern the House of Representatives as will enable a majority of its members to direct its deliberations and control legislation.

We condemn as a violation of the spirit of our institutions the action of the present Chief Executive in using the patronage of his high office to secure the nomination of one of his Cabinet officers. A forced succession in the Presidency is scarcely less repugnant to public sentiment than is life tenure in that office. No good intention on the part of the Executive, and no virtue in the one selected

can justify the establishment of a dynasty. The right of the people freely to select their officials is inalienable and cannot be delegated.

We demand federal legislation forever terminating the partnership which has existed between corporations of the country and the Republican party under the expressed or implied agreement that in return for the contribution of great sums of money, wherewith to purchase elections, they should be allowed to continue substantially unmolested in their efforts to encroach upon the rights of the people.

Any reasonable doubt as to the existence of this relation has been forever dispelled by the sworn testimony of witnesses examined in the insurance investigation in New York and the open admission, unchallenged by the Republican National Committee, of a single individual that he himself, at the personal request of the Republican candidate for the Presidency, raised more than a quarter of a million of dollars to be used in a single State during the closing hours of the last campaign. In order that this practice shall be stopped for all time we demand the passage of a statute punishing with imprisonment any officer of a corporation who shall either contribute on behalf of or consent to the contribution by corporations of any money or thing of value to be used in furthering the election of a President or Vice-President of the United States or of any member of Congress thereof.

We denounce the Republican party, having complete control of the Federal Government, for its failure to pass the bill introduced in the last Congress to compel the publication of the names of contributors and the amounts contributed toward Congress funds, and point to the evidence of their insincerity when they sought by an absolutely irrelevant and impossible amendment to defeat the passage of the bill. As a further evidence of their intention to conduct their campaign in the coming contest with vast sums of money wrested from favor-seeking corporations, we call attention to the fact that the recent Republican National Convention at Chicago refused, when the plank was presented to it, to declare against such practices.

We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law preventing any corporation contributing to a campaign fund, and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable maximum, and providing for the publication before election of all such contributions.

Believing, with Jefferson, in "the support of the State Governments in all their rights as the most competent administration for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwark against anti-Republican tendencies," and in "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our

peace at home and safety abroad," we are opposed to the centralization implied in the suggestions, now frequently made, that the powers of the general government should be extended by judicial construction. There is no twilight zone between the Nation and the State in which exploiting interests can take refuge from both; and it is as necessary that the Federal Government shall exercise the powers delegated to it as it is that the State Governments shall use the authority reserved to them, but we insist that Federal remedies for the regulation of interstate commerce and for the prevention of private monopoly shall be added to, not substituted for, State remedies.

We welcome the belated promise of tariff reform now affected by the Republican party in tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question, but the people cannot safely trust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party. We call attention to the significant fact that the promised relief was postponed until after the coming election — an election to succeed in which the Republican party must have that same support from the beneficiaries of the high protective tariff as it has always heretofore received from them; and to the further fact that during years of uninterrupted power no action whatever has been taken by the Republican Congress to correct the admittedly existing tariff iniquities.

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust controlled products should be placed upon the free list, and material reductions shall be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and graduated reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Existing duties have given to the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price of pulp and of paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs, and that these articles be placed upon the free list.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We therefore favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the additional remedies we specify three: First, a law preventing a duplication of directors among competing corporations; second,

a license system which will, without abridging the right of each State to create corporations or its right to regulate as it will foreign corporations doing business within its limits, make it necessary for a manufacturing or trading corporation engaged in interstate commerce to take out a Federal license before it shall be permitted to control as much as 25 per cent. of the product in which it deals, a license to protect the public from watered stock, and to prohibit the control by such corporation of more than 50 per cent. of the total amount of any product consumed in the United States; and, third, a law compelling such licensed corporations to sell to all purchasers in all parts of the country on the same terms after making due allowance for cost of transportation.

We assert the right of Congress to exercise complete control over interstate commerce and the right of each State to exercise like control over commerce within its borders.

We demand such enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission as may be necessary to enable it to compel railroads to perform their duties as common carriers and prevent discrimination and extortion.

We favor the efficient supervision and rate regulation of railroads engaged in interstate commerce; to this end we recommend the valuation of railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission, such valuation to take into consideration the physical value of the property, the original cost of production, and all elements of value that will render the valuation fair and just.

We favor such legislation as will prohibit the railroads from engaging in business which brings them into competition with their shippers; also legislation which will assure such reduction in transportation rates as conditions will permit, care being taken to avoid reduction that would compel a reduction of wages, prevent adequate service, or do justice to legitimate investments.

We heartily approve the laws prohibiting the pass and the rebate, and we favor any further legislation to restrain, correct and prevent such abuses.

We favor such legislation as will increase the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission, giving to it the initiative with reference to rates and transportation charges put into effect by the railroad companies, and permitting the Interstate Commerce Commission, on its own initiative, to declare a rate illegal and as being more than should be charged for such service; that the present law relating thereto is inadequate by reason of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission is without power to fix or investigate a rate until complaint has been made to it by the shipper.

We further declare that all agreements of traffic or other associations of railway agents affecting interstate rates, service, or classi-

fiction shall be unlawful unless filed with and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We favor the enactment of a law giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to inspect proposed railroad tariff rates or schedules before they shall take effect, and if they be found to be unreasonable to initiate an adjustment thereof.

The panic of 1907, coming without any legitimate excuse, when the Republican party had for a decade been in complete control of the federal government, furnishes additional proof that it is either unwilling or incompetent to protect the interests of the general public. It has so linked the country to Wall Street that the sins of the speculators are visited upon the whole people. While refusing to rescue wealth producers from spoliation at the hands of the stock gamblers and speculators in farm products, it has deposited Treasury funds, without interest and without competition, in favorite banks. It has used an emergency for which it is largely responsible to force through Congress a bill changing the basis of bank currency and inviting market manipulation, and has failed to give to the 15,000,000 depositors of the country protection in their savings.

We believe that in so far as the needs of commerce require an emergency currency such currency should be issued, controlled by the federal government, and loaned on adequate security to national and state banks. We pledge ourselves to legislation under which the national banks shall be required to establish a guarantee fund for the prompt payment of the depositors of any insolvent national bank under an equitable system which shall be available to all state banking institutions which wish to use it.

We favor a postal savings bank if the guaranteed bank cannot be secured, and that it be constituted so as to keep the deposited money in the communities where it is established. But we condemn the policy of the Republican party in proposing postal savings banks under a plan of conduct by which they will aggregate the deposits of rural communities and redeposit the same while under government charge in the banks of Wall Street, thus depleting the circulating medium of the producing regions and unjustly favoring the speculative markets.

We favor an income tax as part of our revenue system, and we urge the submission of a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing Congress to levy and collect a tax upon individual and corporate incomes, to the end that wealth may bear its proportionate share of the burdens of the Federal Government.

✓ The courts of justice are the bulwark of our liberties, and we yield to none in our purpose to maintain their dignity. Our party ✓ has given to the bench a long line of distinguished judges, who

have added to the respect and confidence in which this department must be jealously maintained. We resent the attempt of the Republican party to raise issues respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for the courts.

It is the function of the courts to interpret the laws which the people create, and if the laws appear to work economic, social, or political injustice, it is our duty to change them. The only basis upon which the integrity of our courts can stand is that of unswerving justice and protection of life, personal liberty, and property. If judicial processes may be abused, we should guard them against abuse.

Experience has proved the necessity of a modification of the present law relating to injunctions, and we reiterate the pledge of our national platforms of 1896 and 1904 in favor of the measure which passed the United States Senate in 1896, but which a Republican Congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in federal courts and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

Questions of judicial practice have arisen, especially in connection with industrial disputes. We deem that the parties to all judicial proceedings should be treated with rigid impartiality, and that injunctions should not be issued in any cases in which injunctions would not issue if no industrial dispute were involved.

The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgement of the right of wage-earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions, to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

We favor the eight-hour day on all government work.

We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law by Congress, as far as the federal jurisdiction extends, for a general employers' liability act, covering injury to body or loss of life of employés.

We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law creating a Department of Labor, represented separately in the President's Cabinet, which department shall include the subject of mines and mining.

We believe in the upbuilding of the American and merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the public Treasury.

The constitutional provision that a navy shall be provided and maintained means an adequate navy, and we believe that the interests of this country would be best served by having a navy suffi-

cient to defend the coasts of this country, and protect American citizens wherever their rights may be in jeopardy.

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad, and to use all proper methods to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of law and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under our treaty; and if, under existing treaties, the right of travel and sojourn is denied to American citizens, or recognition is withheld from American passports by any countries on the ground of race or creed, we favor prompt negotiations with the governments of such countries to secure the removal of these unjust discriminations.

We demand that all over the world a duly authorized passport issued by the government of the United States to an American citizen shall be proof of the fact that he is an American citizen and shall entitle him to the treatment due him as such.

The laws pertaining to the Civil Service should be honestly and rigidly enforced to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion rather than services rendered to a political party.

We favor a generous pension policy, both as a matter of justice to the surviving veterans and their dependents, and because it tends to relieve the country of the necessity of maintaining a large standing army.

We advocate the organization of all existing national public health agencies into a national bureau of public health, with such power over sanitary conditions connected with factories, mines, tenements, child labor, and such other subjects as are properly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and do not interfere with the power of the states controlling public health agencies.

The Democratic party favors the extension of agricultural, mechanical, and industrial education. We therefore favor the establishment of district agricultural experiment stations, the secondary agricultural and mechanical colleges in the several states.

We favor the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people, and regard this reform as the gateway to other national reforms.

We welcome Oklahoma to the sisterhood of states, and heartily congratulate her on the auspicious beginning of a great career.

We believe that the Panama Canal will prove of great value to our country, and favor its speedy completion.

The national Democratic party has for the last sixteen years labored for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate States of the Federal Union, and recognizing that each possesses

every qualification to successfully maintain separate State governments, we favor the immediate admission of these Territories as separate States.

The establishment of rules and regulations, if any such are necessary, in relation to free grazing upon the public lands outside of forest or other reservations until the same shall eventually be disposed of should be left to the people of the States respectively in which such lands may be situated.

Water furnishes the cheapest means of transportation, and the National Government, having the control of navigable waters, should improve them to their fullest capacity. We earnestly favor the immediate adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for improving every watercourse in the Union which is justified by the needs of commerce, and to secure that end we favor, when practicable, the connection of the Great Lakes with the navigable rivers and with the Gulf through the Mississippi River, and the navigable rivers with each other, and the rivers, bays, and sounds of our coasts with each other by artificial canals, with a view to perfecting a system of inland waterways, to be navigated by vessels of standard draught.

We favor the coördination of the various services of the Government connected with waterways in one service, for the purpose of aiding in the completion of such a system of inland waterways; and we favor the creation of a fund ample for continuous work, which shall be conducted under the direction of a commission of experts to be authorized by law.

We favor Federal aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law to regulate, under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the rates and services of telegraph and telephone companies engaged in the transmission of messages between the States.

We repeat the demand for internal development and for the conservation of our natural resources contained in previous platforms, the enforcement of which Mr. Roosevelt has vainly sought from a reluctant party, and to that end we insist upon the preservation, protection, and replacement of needed forests, the preservation of the public domain for homeseekers, the protection of the national resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control; the development of our waterways for navigation and every other useful purpose, including the irrigation of arid lands, the reclamation of swamp lands, the clarification of streams, the development of water power and the preservation of electric power generated by this natural force from the control

of monopoly; and to such end we urge the exercise of all powers, national, State, and municipal, both separately and in coöperation.

We insist upon a policy of administration of our forest reserve which shall relieve it of the abuses which have arisen thereunder, and which shall, as far as practicable, conform to the police regulations of the several States where they are located, which shall enable homesteaders as of right to occupy and acquire title to all portions thereof which are especially adapted to agriculture, and which shall furnish a system of timber sales available as well to the private citizen as to the larger manufacturer and consumer.

We favor the application of principles of land laws of the United States to our newly acquired territory, Hawaii, to the end that the public lands of that territory may be held and utilized for the benefit of bona-fide homesteaders.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in enormous expense, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our nation open to the charge of abandoning a fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

We demand for the people of Alaska and Porto Rico the full enjoyment of the rights and privileges of a territorial form of government. The officials appointed to administer the government of all our territories and the District of Columbia should be thoroughly qualified by previous bona-fide residence.

The Democratic party recognizes the importance and advantage of developing closer ties of Pan-American friendship and commerce between the United States and her sister nations of Latin America, and favors the taking of such steps, consistent with Democratic policies, for better acquaintance, greater mutual confidence, and larger exchange of trade, as will bring lasting benefit not only to the United States, but to this group of American Republics, having constitutions, forms of government, ambitions and interests akin to our own.

We favor full protection, by both national and State governments, within their respective spheres, of all foreigners residing in the United States under treaty, but we are opposed to the admission of Asiatic immigrants who cannot be amalgated with our

population, or whose presence among us would raise a race issue and involve us in diplomatic controversies with Oriental powers.

We believe that where an American citizen holding a patent in a foreign country is compelled to manufacture under his patent within a certain time similar restrictions should be applied in this country to the citizens or subjects of such a country.

The Democratic party stands for democracy; the Republican has drawn to itself all that is aristocratic and plutocratic.

The Democratic party is the champion of civil rights and opportunities to all; the Republican party is the party of privileges and private monopoly. The Democratic party listens to the voice of the whole people and gauges progress by the prosperity and advancement of the average man; the Republican party is subservient to the comparatively few who are the beneficiaries of governmental favoritism. We invite the coöperation of all, regardless of previous political affiliation or past differences, who desire to preserve a government of the people by the people and for the people, and who favor such an administration of the government as will insure, as far as human wisdom can, that each citizen shall draw from society a reward commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society.

The platform having been adopted unanimously without discussion, a further resolution was moved from the floor, and adopted, urging an appropriate celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, on February 12, 1909. The convention then proceeded to make nomination of candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States. The vote on the nomination of a candidate for President was as follows:—

Whole number of votes ¹	994
Necessary for a choice (two thirds).	666
William J. Bryan, of Nebraska	888½
George Gray, of Delaware	59½
John A. Johnson, of Minnesota	46

The nomination of Mr. Bryan was then made unanimous, and the convention adjourned — at a quarter before four o'clock in the morning, after a continuous session of nearly nine hours.

The business was concluded in the afternoon of the same day, Friday the 10th. Nominating speeches for a candidate for Vice-President were made in favor of John W. Kern, of Indiana, Charles A. Towne, of New York, Archibald McNeil, of Con-

¹ Eight delegates not voting.

necticut, and Clark Howell, of Georgia. All the names except that of Mr. Kern were subsequently withdrawn, and he was nominated by acclamation.

The convention of the Prohibition party was held at Columbus, beginning on July 15. Robert E. Patton, of Illinois, was the temporary chairman, and Charles Scanlon, of Pennsylvania, the permanent president. Thirty-seven States were represented by 1126 delegates.

The proceedings were enlivened only by a somewhat animated controversy among the delegates whether or not woman suffrage should be explicitly advocated,— the outcome of which may be seen in the thirteenth plank of the platform, — and by the canvassing for a multiplicity of candidates for the head of the ticket. The platform, which is of almost unexampled brevity, was as follows:—

The Prohibition party of the United States, assembled in convention at Columbus, Ohio, July 15-16, 1908, expressing gratitude to Almighty God for the victories of our principles in the past, for encouragement at present, and for confidence in early and triumphant success in the future, makes the following declaration of principles, and pledges their enactment into law when placed in power:—

1. The submission by Congress to the several States, of an amendment to the Federal constitution prohibiting the manufacture, sale, importation, exportation, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes.

2. The immediate prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes in the District of Columbia, in the Territories, and all places over which the National Government has jurisdiction; the repeal of the internal revenue tax on alcoholic liquors and the prohibition of interstate traffic therein.

3. The election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

4. Equitable graduated income and inheritance taxes.

5. The establishment of postal savings banks and the guaranty of deposits in banks.

6. The regulation of all corporations doing an interstate commerce business.

7. The creation of a permanent tariff commission.

8. The strict enforcement of law instead of official tolerance and practical license of the social evil which prevails in many of our cities, with its unspeakable traffic in girls.

9. Uniform marriage and divorce laws.

10. An equitable and constitutional employers' liability act.
11. Court review of Post-Office Department decisions.
12. The prohibition of child labor in mines, workshops, and factories.

13. Legislation basing suffrage only upon intelligence and ability to read and write the English language.

14. The preservation of the mineral and forest resources of the country, and the improvement of the highways and waterways.

Believing in the righteousness of our cause and the final triumph of our principles, and convinced of the unwillingness of the Republican and Democratic parties to deal with these issues, we invite to full party fellowship all citizens who are with us agreed.

Three trials were necessary to effect the nomination of a candidate for President. They resulted as follows: —

	<i>1st</i>	<i>2d</i>	<i>3d</i>
Eugene W. Chafin, of Illinois . . .	193	226	636
William B. Patmore, of Missouri . .	273	418	415
Joseph P. Tracy, of Michigan . . .	161	81	7
Alfred L. Maniere, of New York . .	159	121	4
Daniel R. Sheen, of Illinois . . .	134	157	12
Frederick F. Wheeler, of California	72	37	—
Oliver W. Stewart, of Illinois . . .	61	47	—
J. B. Cranfill, of Texas	28	—	—
G. R. Stewart, of Vermont	1	—	—
Charles Scanlon, of Pennsylvania .	1	—	—
<hr/>			
Whole number of votes	1083	1087	1074
Necessary to a choice	542	544	538

The nomination of Mr. Chafin was made unanimous. The convention then proceeded to nominate for Vice-President, by acclamation, the Rev. William B. Patmore, of Missouri, who had led the field as a candidate for the presidency on the first and second votes and was Mr. Chafin's only strong competitor on the third. But Mr. Patmore declined the nomination. At this point there was much confusion and a "parliamentary tangle"; and many of the delegates had already left the hall when the vote was taken for a candidate. The result was: —

Whole number of votes	702
Necessary to a choice	352
Aaron S. Watkins, of Ohio	535
T. B. Demaree, of Kentucky	126
Charles F. Holler, of Indiana	41

The nomination of Mr. Watkins was made unanimous. Both the candidates were also candidates of their party for Governor in their respective States.

The last national convention of the canvass was that of the Independence party—the outgrowth of Mr. Hearst's Independence League. It was held at Chicago, beginning on July 27. William R. Hearst, of New York, was the temporary chairman, and Charles A. Walsh, of Iowa, the permanent president. The number of States represented was not published, but on the final vote for a candidate for President, the number voting was 948.

The only incident of the convention that needs to be mentioned is the angry and even personally hostile treatment visited upon a delegate from Nebraska, who endeavored to present the name of Mr. Bryan as a candidate for nomination by the convention.

The platform adopted was as follows:—

We, independent American citizens, representing the Independence party in forty-four states and two territories, have met in national convention to nominate, absolutely independent of all other political parties, candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States. Our action is based upon a determination to wrest the conduct of public affairs from the hands of selfish interests, political tricksters, and corrupt bosses, and make the government, as the founders intended, an agency for the common good.

At a period of unexampled national prosperity and promise a staggering blow was dealt to legitimate business by the unmolested practice of stock watering and dishonest financiering. Multitudes of defenceless investors, thousands of honest business men, and an army of idle workingmen are paying the penalty. Year by year, fostered by reckless governmental extravagance, by the manipulation of trusts, and by a privilege creating tariff, the cost of living mounts higher and higher. Day by day the control of the government drifts further away from the people and more firmly into the grip of machine politicians and party bosses.

The Republican and Democratic parties are not only responsible for these conditions, but are committed to their indefinite continuance. Prodigal of promises, they are so barren of performance that to a new party of independent voters the country must look for the establishment of a new policy and a return to genuine popular government.

Our object is not to introduce violent innovations or startlingly new features. We of the Independence party look back as Lincoln

did to the Declaration of Independence as the fountain head of all political inspiration. It is not our purpose to attempt to revolutionize the American system of government, but to restore the action of the government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln. It is not our purpose, either, to effect a radical change in the American system of government, but to conserve for the citizens of the United States their privileges and liberties, won for them by the founders of this government, and to perpetuate the principles and policies upon which the nation's greatness has been built.

The Independence party is, therefore, a conservative force in American politics, devoted to the preservation of American liberty and independence, to honesty in elections, to opportunity in business, and to equality before the law.

Those who believe in the Independence party and work with it are convinced that a genuine democracy should exist; that a true republican form of government should continue; that the power of government should rest with the majority of the people, and that the government should be conducted for the benefit of the whole citizenship rather than for the special advantage of any particular class.

As of first importance in order to restore the power of government to the people, to make their will supreme in the primaries, in the elections, and in the control of public officials after they have been elected, we declare for direct nominations, the initiative and referendum, and the right of recall. It is idle to cry out against the evil of bossism while we perpetuate a system under which the boss is inevitable. The destruction of the individual boss is of little value. The people in their politics must establish a system which will eliminate not only an objectionable boss, but the system of bossism. Representative government is made a mockery by the system of modern party conventions dominated by the bosses and controlled by cliques. We demand the natural remedy of direct nominations by which the people not only elect, but — which is far more important — select their representatives.

We believe in the principle of the initiative and referendum, and we particularly demand that no franchise grant go into operation until the terms and conditions have been approved by popular vote in the locality interested.

We demand for the people the right to recall public officials from the public service. The power to make officials resides in the people, and in them also should reside the power to unmake and remove from office any official who demonstrates his unfitness or betrays the public trust.

Of next importance in destroying the power of selfish special

interests and the corrupt political bosses whom they control is to wrest from their hands their main weapon, the corruption fund. We demand severe and effective legislation against all forms of corrupt practices at elections, and advocate prohibiting the use of any money at elections except for meetings, literature, and the necessary travelling expenses of the candidates. Bidding for votes the Republican and Democratic candidates are making an outcry about publicity of contributions, although both the Republican and Democratic parties have for years consistently blocked every effort to pass a corrupt practices act. Publicity of contributions is desirable and should be required, but the main matter of importance is the use to which contributions are put. We believe that the dishonest use of money in the past, whether contributed by individuals or by corporations, has been chiefly responsible for the corruption which has undermined our system of popular government.

We demand honest conduct of public office and business alike, and of economical administration of public affairs, and we condemn the gross extravagance of federal administration and its appalling annual increase in appropriations. Unnecessary appropriations mean unnecessary taxes, and unnecessary taxes, whether direct or indirect, are paid by the people, and add to the ever increasing cost of living.

We condemn the evil of overcapitalization. Modern industrial conditions make the corporation and stock company a necessity, but overcapitalization in corporations is as harmful and criminal as is personal dishonesty in an individual.

Compelling the payment of dividends upon great sums that have never been invested, upon masses of watered stock not justified by the property, overcapitalization prevents the better wages, the better public service, and the lower cost that should result from American inventive genius and that wide organization which is replacing costly individual competition. The collapse of dishonestly inflated enterprises robs investors, closes banks, destroys confidence, and engenders panics. The Independence party advocates as a primary necessity for sounder business conditions and improved public service the enactment of laws, state and national, to prevent watering of stock, dishonest issue of bonds, and other forms of corporation frauds.

We denounce the so-called labor planks of the Republican and Democratic platforms as political buncombe and contemptible claptrap, unworthy of national parties claiming to be serious and sincere.

The Republican declaration that injunction or temporary or restraining order should not be issued without notice, except where

irreparable injury would result from delay, is empty verbiage, for a showing of irreparable injury can always be made, and is always made, in *ex parte* affidavits.

The Democratic declaration that "injunctions should not be issued in any case in which injunctions should not issue if no industrial dispute were involved" is meaningless and worthless.

Such insincere and meaningless declarations place a low estimate upon the intelligence of the average American workingman, and exhibit either ignorance of or indifference to the real interest of labor.

The Independence party condemns the arbitrary use of the writ of injunction and contempt proceedings as a violation of the fundamental American right of trial by jury.

From the foundation of our Government down to 1872 the Federal Judiciary act prohibited the issue of any injunction without reasonable notice until after a hearing. We assert that in all actions growing out of a dispute between employers and employés concerning terms or conditions of employment no injunction should issue until after a trial upon the merits, that such trial should be held before a jury, and that in no case of alleged contempt should any person be deprived of liberty without a trial by jury.

The Independence party believes that the distribution of wealth is as important as the creation of wealth, and indorses these organizations among farmers and workers which tend to bring about a just distribution of wealth through good wages for workers and good prices for farmers, and which protect the employer and the consumer through equality of price for labor and for product, and we favor such legislation as will remove them from the operation of the Sherman anti-trust law.

We indorse the eight-hour work day, favor its application to all Government employés, and demand the enactment of laws requiring that all work done for the Government, whether Federal or State, and whether done directly or indirectly through contractors or sub-contractors shall be done on an eight-hour basis.

We favor the enactment of a law defining as illegal any combination or conspiracy to black-list employés.

We demand protection for workmen through enforced use of standard safety appliances and provisions of hygienic conditions in the operation of factories, railways, mills, mines, and all industrial undertakings.

We advocate State and Federal inspection of railways to secure a greater safety for railway employés and for the travelling public. We call for the enactment of stringent laws fixing employers' liabilities, and a rigid prohibition of child labor through coöperation between the State governments and the National Government.

We condemn the manufacture and sale of prison-made goods in the open market in competition with free labor manufactured goods. We demand that convicts shall be employed direct by the different States in the manufacture of products for use in State institutions and in making good roads, and in no case shall convicts be hired out to contractors or sub-contractors.

We favor the creation of a Department of Labor, including mines and mining, the head of which shall be a member of the President's Cabinet.

The great abuses of grain inspection, by which the producers are plundered, demand immediate and vigorous correction. To that end we favor Federal inspection under a strict civil service law.

The Independence party declares that the right to issue money is inherent in the Government, and it favors the establishment of a central governmental bank, through which the money so issued shall be put into general circulation.

We demand a revision of the tariff, not by the friends of the tariff, but by the friends of the people, and declare for a gradual reduction of tariff duties, with just consideration for the rights of the consuming public and of established industry. There should be no protection for oppressive trusts which sell cheaply abroad and take advantage of the tariff at home to crush competition, raise prices, control production, and limit work and wages.

The railroads must be kept open to all upon exactly equal terms. Every form of rebate and discrimination in railroad rates is a crime against business and must be stamped out. We demand adequate railroad facilities and advocate a bill empowering shippers in time of need to compel railroads to provide sufficient cars for freight and passenger traffic and other railroad facilities through summary appeal to the courts. We favor the creation of an Interstate Commerce Court, whose sole function it shall be to review speedily and enforce summarily the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to initiate investigation into the reasonableness of rates and practices, and no increase in rates should be put into effect until opportunity for such investigation is afforded. The Interstate Commerce Commission should proceed at once with a physical valuation of railroads engaged in interstate commerce.

We believe that legitimate organizations in business designed to secure an economy of operation and increased production are beneficial wherever the public participates in the advantages which result. We denounce all combinations for restraint of trade and for the establishment of monopoly in all products of labor, and declare that such combinations are not combinations for production,

but for extortion, and that activity in this direction is not industry, but robbery.

In cases of infractions of the Anti-Trust law or of the Interstate Commerce act, we believe in the enforcement of a prison penalty against the guilty and responsible individuals controlling the management of the offending corporations, rather than a fine imposed upon stockholders.

We advocate the extension of the principle of public ownership of public utilities, including railroads, as rapidly as municipal, State, or National Government shall demonstrate ability to conduct public utilities for the public benefit. We favor specifically government ownership of the telegraphs, such as prevails in every other civilized country in the world, and demand as an immediate measure that the Government shall purchase and operate the telegraphs in connection with the postal service.

The parcels post system should be rapidly and widely extended, and government postal savings banks should be established where the people's deposits will be secure, the money to be loaned to the people in the locality of the several banks at a rate of interest to be fixed by the government.

We favor the immediate development of a national system of good roads connecting all states, and national aid to states in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

We favor a court of review of the censorship and arbitrary rulings of the Post-Office Department.

We favor the admission of Arizona and New Mexico to separate statehood.

We advocate such legislation, both state and national, as will suppress the bucket shop and prohibit the fictitious selling of farm products for future delivery.

We favor the creation of a national department of public health, to be presided over by a member of the medical profession, this department to exercise such authority over matters of public health, hygiene, and sanitation which come properly within the jurisdiction of the national government as does not interfere with the rights of states or municipalities.

We oppose Asiatic immigration, which does not amalgamate with our population, creates race issues and un-American conditions, and which reduces wages and tends to lower the high standard of living and the high standard of morality which American civilization has established.

We demand the passage of an exclusion act which shall protect American workingmen from competition with Asiatic cheap labor and which shall protect American civilization from the contamination of Asiatic conditions.

The Independence party declares for peace and against aggression, and will promote the movement for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

We believe, however, that a small navy is poor economy, and that a strong navy is the best protection in time of war and the best preventive of war. We therefore favor the speedy building of a navy sufficiently strong to protect at the same time both the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts of the United States.

We rejoice in the adoption by both the Democratic and Republican platforms of the demand of the Independence party for improved national waterways and the Mississippi inland deep-waters project, to complete a ship canal from the Gulf to the Great Lakes. We favor the extension of this system to the tributaries of the Mississippi, by means of which thirty states shall be served and 20,000 miles added to the coast line of the United States. The reclamation of arid land should be continued and the irrigation programme now contemplated by the government extended and steps taken for the conservation of the country's natural resources, which should be guarded not only against devastation and waste, but against falling into the control of the monopoly.

The abuses growing out of the administration of our forest preserves must be corrected, and provisions should be made for free grazing from public lands outside of forest or other reservations. In behalf of the people residing in arid portions of our Western states we protest vigorously against the policy of the federal government in selling the exclusive use of water and electric power derived from public works to private corporations, thus creating a monopoly and subjecting citizens living in those sections to exorbitant charges for light and power, and diverting enterprises originally started for public benefit into channels for corporate greed and oppression, and we demand that no more exclusive contracts be made.

American citizens abroad, whether native born or naturalized, and of whatever race or creed, must be secured in the enjoyment of all rights and privileges under our treaties, and wherever such rights are withheld by any country on the ground of race or religious faith, steps should be taken to secure the removal of such unjust discrimination.

We advocate the popular election of United States Senators, and of judges, both state and federal, and favor a graduated income tax and any constitutional amendment necessary to these ends.

Equality of opportunity, the largest measure of individual liberty consistent with equal rights; the overthrow of the rule of special interest and the restoration of government by the majority

exercised for the benefit of the whole community; these are the purposes to which the Independence party is pledged, and we invite the coöperation of all patriots and progressive citizens, irrespective of party, who are in sympathy with these principles and in favor of their practical enforcement.

The nomination of a candidate for President was effected only on the third trial. The result on each vote was as follows:—

	<i>1st</i>	<i>2d</i>	<i>3d</i>
Thomas L. Hisgen, of Massachusetts	391	590	831
John T. Graves, of Georgia	213	189	77
Milford W. Howard, of Alabama	200	109	38
Reuben R. Lyon, of New York	71	—	—
William R. Hearst, of New York	49	49	2
Whole number of votes	924	937	948
Necessary to a choice (two thirds)	617	624	632

The customary vote to make the nomination of Mr. Hisgen unanimous was adopted. John Temple Graves, of Georgia, was nominated for Vice-President by acclamation.

Official and ceremonial notification of nominations has become a prominent feature of every presidential canvass. It is not technically the opening of the campaign, but is made the occasion of great popular demonstrations and enables candidates to sound a "keynote." Mr. Taft was informed of his nomination at Cincinnati, on July 28; Mr. Bryan, at his home in Lincoln, on August 12; Mr. Hisgen, in New York City, on August 31. Later came the notifications to the candidates for Vice-President, — Mr. Sherman, at Utica, Mr. Kern, at Indianapolis, and Mr. Graves, at Atlanta. There were great throngs of people at all these ceremonies. In some cases the attempt was made, with a certain amount of success, to make the occasion non-partisan.

Both Mr. Taft and Mr. Bryan intended originally not to make any political tours. It was announced at first that Mr. Bryan would conduct a "front porch" campaign, that he would stay at home and make speeches to such friends and supporters as might call upon him there. Mr. Taft, who made a long stay at Hot Springs, Virginia, caused it to be known that under no circumstances would he journey over the country on a stump-ing tour. Both of them changed their plans. Moreover, Mr. Hisgen and Mr. Chafin were seen on the stump in many States. Mr. Bryan was first in the field. He started on the 20th of

August on a seven-days' trip and spoke at many points in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas. On the 30th he began another tour which took him as far as Minnesota and the Dakotas. He made a third, much longer trip, beginning September 6, and before his return had spoken in States so far apart as Rhode Island and Colorado. The closing weeks of the canvass found him in the East, devoting much attention to New York, New Jersey, and Ohio.

Mr. Taft made his first political speech at Hot Springs, on August 21, and although he spoke a few times later in the month and early in September at various places in Ohio, did not enter upon an extended tour until September 23. From that time until the day of election he was almost constantly travelling and addressing rallies of his supporters. His itinerary carried him all over the Middle West, and he also visited Colorado, Wyoming, and the Dakotas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Toward the end of the campaign he was in the East, and spoke in several of the "border" States, Kentucky, West Virginia, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. Like Mr. Bryan he closed the campaign in New York and Ohio.

There was the usual optimism on both sides regarding the result. Vermont held its State election on September 1, and registered a little less — some two thousand — than the usual Republican majority, a result which gave the Democrats some encouragement. A week later Maine followed with a large reduction. The Republican plurality was but a little more than 8000, which was less than half the customary plurality. The Republicans explained that local conditions and local questions were answerable for the decline, and the assertion was true, but the Democrats believed that it presaged victory for them. But aside from the managers of the campaign, and those whom they could inspire with hopefulness, the belief that Mr. Taft was to be elected was general.

The election took place on November 3, and resulted in a Republican victory. The popular and electoral vote is shown in the accompanying table.

An analysis of the vote will reveal several points worthy of notice. The aggregate vote increased over that at the election of 1904 almost exactly ten per cent, — 1,362,881, — but it increased less than seven per cent over the enormous vote of 1896. But in the sixteen Southern States — from all the analyses Oklahoma is omitted, as it did not participate in any

1908

STATES	POPULAR VOTE							ELECTORAL VOTE	
	Taft and Sherman Republican	Bryan and Kern Democratic	Chafin and Watkins Prohibition	Debs and Hanford Socialist	Gilhaus and Munro Socialist-Labor	Watson and Williams Populist	Hisgen and Graves Independence	Taft and Sherman	Bryan and Kern
Alabama	26283	74374	665	1399	-	1568	495	-	11
Arkansas	56760	87015	1194	5842	-	1026	289	-	9
California	214398	127492	11770	28659	-	-	4278	10	-
Colorado	123700	126644	5559	7974	-	-	-	-	5
Connecticut	112815	68255	2380	5113	608	-	728	7	-
Delaware	25014	22071	670	239	-	-	30	3	-
Florida	10654	31104	553	3747	-	1946	1356	-	5
Georgia	41692	72413	1059	584	-	16969	77	-	13
Idaho	52621	36162	1986	6400	-	-	119	3	-
Illinois	629932	450810	29364	34711	1680	633	7724	27	-
Indiana	348993	338262	18045	13476	643	1193	514	15	-
Iowa	275210	200771	9837	8287	-	261	404	13	-
Kansas	197216	161209	5033	12420	-	-	68	10	-
Kentucky	235711	244092	5887	4185	404	333	200	-	13
Louisiana	8958	63568	-	2538	-	-	82	-	9
Maine	66987	35403	1487	1758	-	-	700	6	-
Maryland	116513	115908	3302	2323	-	-	485	2	6
Massachusetts	265966	155543	4379	10781	1018	-	19239	16	-
Michigan	333313	174619	16795	11527	1086	-	734	14	-
Minnesota	195843	109401	11107	14527	-	-	426	11	-
Mississippi	4363	60287	-	978	-	1276	-	-	10
Missouri	347203	346374	4284	15431	868	1165	402	18	-
Montana	32333	29326	827	5855	-	-	481	3	-
Nebraska	126997	131009	5179	3524	-	-	-	-	8
Nevada	10775	11212	-	2103	-	-	436	-	3
New Hampshire	53149	33655	905	1299	-	-	584	4	-
New Jersey	265326	182567	4934	10253	1196	-	2922	12	-
New York	870070	667468	22667	38451	3877	-	35817	39	-
North Carolina	114887	136928	-	345	-	-	-	-	12
North Dakota	57680	32885	1496	2421	-	-	43	4	-
Ohio	572312	502721	11402	33705	721	162	439	23	-
Oklahoma	110558	122406	-	21779	-	434	244	-	7
Oregon	62530	38049	2682	7339	-	-	289	4	-
Pennsylvania	745779	448785	36694	33913	1222	-	1057	34	-
Rhode Island	43942	24706	1016	1365	183	-	1105	4	-
South Carolina	3965	62290	-	100	-	-	43	-	9
South Dakota	67536	40266	4039	2846	-	-	88	4	-
Tennessee	118324	135608	300	1870	-	1081	332	-	12
Texas	65666	217302	1634	7870	176	994	115	-	18
Utah	61165	42601	-	4890	-	-	92	3	-
Vermont	39552	11496	799	-	-	-	804	4	-
Virginia	52573	82946	1111	255	25	105	51	-	12
Washington	106062	58691	4700	14177	-	-	249	5	-
West Virginia	137869	111418	5139	3679	-	-	46	7	-
Wisconsin	247747	166662	11565	28147	314	-	-	13	-
Wyoming	20846	14918	66	1715	-	-	64	3	-
Total	7677788	6407982	252511	420890	14021	29146	83651	321	162

election before 1908—the vote was 434,800 less in 1908 than in 1896.

A comparison of the vote of 1908 with that of 1904, either

as a whole or by groups of States, seems to confirm the conclusions advanced in the previous chapter. It was there suggested that the "safe and sane" policy of the Democrats led a considerable body of that party to vote for Mr. Roosevelt in preference to Judge Parker, in the belief that the Republican candidate was the more radical of the two, and that it also caused a much larger number to withhold their votes altogether. The return of Mr. Bryan to the leadership detached from the Republicans those radical Democrats who had supported Mr. Roosevelt four years before, and it also drew to Mr. Taft some conservative Democrats who had voted for Judge Parker. At the same time the abstainers of 1904 now went to the polls for Mr. Bryan. As a result the gains and losses of the Republican candidate virtually offset each other, and the Democratic vote was largely increased. The aggregate vote does not contradict this theory. Mr. Taft's total vote was less than 50,000 more than Roosevelt's, but Mr. Bryan's was 1,323,000 more than Parker's.

Comparing, as in the last chapter, the vote for the leading candidates by groups of States, we find that in New England, which is rather more conservative than some other parts of the country, the change was small, as it was between 1900 and 1904. In round numbers the comparison stands thus:—

	1904	1908
Republican	569,600	576,400
Democratic	335,000	329,000

If any inference may be drawn it is that a larger number of conservative Democrats deserted their party than had been the case in 1904. But that assertion cannot be made of any other group of States. In New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania the comparison shows:—

	1904	1908
Republican	1,945,600	1,881,200
Democratic	1,184,000	1,298,800

Here the Republicans lost 64,400, and the Democrats gained 114,800. The change is not a large one, but so far as it goes it is the reversal of the tendency of the previous four years which we should expect. The tendency to a return to normal conditions is more strongly marked in the next group—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan,—as the reverse tendency was stronger four years before. In 1904 the change

in the four States was a gain of 170,000 by the Republicans, a loss of 420,000 by the Democrats. Now the change is indicated by the following figures:—

	1904	1908
Republican	1,963,900	1,875,600
Democratic	1,080,800	1,466,400

That is, a loss of 88,000 by the Republicans, and a gain of 385,000 by the Democrats. But the net result of the change in eight years is an increase of 114,000 in the Republican majority. The change in the seven States of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas, is still more pronounced. In 1904 the Republicans gained 116,400 over their vote in 1900; the Democrats lost 344,700. The comparison between 1904 and 1908 is as follows:—

	1904	1908
Republican	1,278,600	1,168,200
Democratic	501,300	842,300

That is, the Democrats gained 341,000; the Republicans lost 110,400; and the net result, as compared with 1900, was a gain of 6000 by the Republicans, and of 24,700 by the Democrats,—in short, an almost precise return to the former conditions. The other Western and the Pacific States—nine in number, growing in population more rapidly than the rest of the country—show the same tendency. In 1904 the Republicans cast 194,600 more votes than in 1900; the Democrats, 132,500 fewer. In 1908 the Republicans increased their vote by only 10,000; the Democrats by 163,600, as is indicated by the following statement:—

	1904	1908
Republican	674,400	684,400
Democratic	321,500	485,100

It is to be borne in mind, with reference to this last group of States, that in 1900 the effect of the Free Silver campaign had not disappeared altogether, and the Republicans had a net plurality of only 25,800, which was increased in 1904 to 352,900, and decreased in 1908 to 199,300.

Finally we have the sixteen Southern States. There are contests comparable to those in the North in Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri; the voting is of a more languid character in North Carolina, Tennessee, and

Arkansas, but elections have a certain appearance of being contested, which is not the case in Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. But it is best to consider the whole group of sixteen States, without making the distinction. In 1900 the Democrats had a net majority in those States of 495,400; in 1904 their plurality was 412,200, the combined vote for the two leading parties having decreased 571,400. The record for the elections of 1904 and 1908 was:—

	1904	1908
Republican	1,244,400	1,366,400
Democratic	1,656,600	1,863,900

The Republican vote increased 122,000, but was still 122,100 below that of 1900. The Democratic vote increased 207,300, but was still 120,000 below the 1900 vote. The aggregate vote for the two leading candidates in 1908 exceeded that in 1904 by 299,300, of which number 167,700 was contributed by the five States which were closely contested, 89,600 by the three States of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas, and only 40,000 by the other eight.

It is a common impression that the aggregate vote given to the minor parties and candidates shows a tendency to increase. Such is not the fact. General Weaver received a larger popular vote in 1892 than the combined votes given to all the minor candidates in either 1904 or 1908. The Socialist party has increased its vote largely at the last two elections, and its vote was but slightly larger in 1908 than in 1904. The aggregate vote given to all the minor candidates at the last eight elections is given below:—

Year	Minor Candidates
1880	318,883
1884	325,736
1888	400,510
1892	1,318,259 ¹
1896	538,881 ²
1900	394,809 ³
1904	809,881 ⁴
1908	800,219 ⁵

¹ General Weaver, 1,040,886.

³ Socialist vote, 94,864.

⁵ Socialist vote, 420,890.

² Bryan and Watson, 222,583.

⁴ Socialist vote, 402,895.

In 1904 for the first time the Socialist candidates received some votes in every state. In 1908 they were voted for in every State except Vermont.

The count of the electoral votes took place on February 10, 1909. The proceedings were identical in form with those that were observed in 1905. The concurrent resolution prescribing the form was passed by both houses of Congress without a suggestion of amendment, without debate, and without opposition. The only incident of the count—and it is hardly worthy of mention—is that the electors for the State of Wisconsin were found to have certified that their votes for President were given to William H. Taft, of New York. The tellers were permitted to treat the error as an accident, and the votes were counted as for Mr. Taft, of Ohio.

The inauguration, which took place on March 4, 1909, possessed some features worthy of notice. Arrangements were made for unusual display and ceremony. The installation of a President in office has gradually become an occasion for spectacular effects and for immense gatherings of politicians and of supporters of the new President. It was estimated that on the great day in 1909 Washington contained more than a hundred thousand visitors who had been drawn to the capital city to witness the advent of a new administration.

The Weather Bureau predicted a fine day for the ceremony, but the weather is capricious in early March, and Washington awoke on that morning to find a severe storm raging—wind, and snow, and sleet, and rain. Most elaborate bunting decorations adorned the buildings along Pennsylvania Avenue. They were drenched and drooping long before the President and the President-elect entered the motor-car at the White House to proceed to the Capitol. When the distinguished company was assembled in the Senate Chamber—both houses of Congress, the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, and the Diplomatic Corps—the oath was administered to Mr. Sherman, the Vice-President-elect, who delivered a brief inaugural address, the Senate adjourned, the Senate as it was to be constituted for the ensuing two years was called to order, and the oath was administered to the new senators.

At this point it is customary for a procession to be formed to proceed to the east front of the Capitol, where the oath of office is taken by the new President in the presence of assembled tens of thousands of people. But owing to the extremely in-

clement weather and the age of many of those in official position who would take part in the procession, the inauguration took place in the Senate Chamber. The oath was administered to Mr. Taft by Chief Justice Fuller, — the sixth, and last, time that he inducted a President into office. The ambition of Mr. Taft, of which he made no secret, to occupy a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court, led to an interesting variation of the ceremony. It has been the custom of Presidents to take the oath on a Bible, usually presented to them for the purpose, and to retain the book. But Mr. Taft wished to make use of the Bible on which, for well-nigh a century, justices of the Supreme Court have placed a hand when taking the oath.

After the delivery of the inaugural address, Mr. Roosevelt, now a private citizen, retired from the Senate Chamber, hotly applauded as he withdrew, and under the escort of a large body of New Yorkers, went directly to the railway station, where he was soon joined by Mrs. Roosevelt, and took the train for his home at Oyster Bay.

That also was a departure from custom, for it has been usual for the retiring President to accompany his successor not only in going to the Capitol, but on the return to the White House. On this occasion both Mr. Taft and Mr. Sherman were accompanied by their wives on the return journey. The parade which had been planned was carried out in spite of slush in the street and sleet in the air, and the newly installed President and Vice-President reviewed it from a stand in front of the White House.

IV

THE REPUBLICAN SCHISM

ON the morning after the inauguration, in 1909, many of the daily newspapers of the country "featured" a photograph of the outgoing and incoming Presidents standing side by side, which was taken the moment before they left together the White House for the Capitol, where Mr. Taft was to take the oath of office. The two men, then so friendly, were nevertheless to be, willingly or unwillingly, the central figures in the most furiously waged contest that ever wrecked an American political party.

The breach, the division, seen after the event to have been inevitable, had many contributing causes, but the underlying cause was the strong personality of Theodore Roosevelt, which had won for him a countless host of followers, unalterably determined to accept none but him as a leader.

The Republican party was organized originally for a radical purpose, to stem the progress of slavery. Gradually, so soon as its chief objects — emancipation, restoration of the Union, reconstruction, and a protective tariff — had been achieved, it became essentially the conservative party of the country; and the Democrats, allying themselves successively with Greenbackers, Populists, and Free Silver men, fell completely under the control of a radical element. The Democratic party, nevertheless, still retained in its membership a considerable contingent of conservatives, many of whom manifested their independence by their support of Palmer and Buckner in 1896; others, in order to preserve their party standing and regularity, and in the hope of a revulsion sooner or later against radicalism, voted the straight ticket in that election, with great reluctance. Eight years later, after two party defeats, they were nominally allowed to assume control in order to test their strength in the country. The result was a third defeat and a resumption of leadership by the radicals.

Meantime, on the death of President McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt had succeeded to office. Although, during the remainder of the McKinley term, so far as his natural

disposition permitted he kept his promise to continue the policies — they were conservative policies — of his predecessor, he soon gave unmistakable indications that the bent of his mind was not merely mildly but strongly radical. Yet he had obtained an extraordinary hold upon the people of the country, and his nomination for a full term and his election were inevitable. The really conservative opinion within his party made little secret of its opposition to him, but there was no open opposition after he was nominated. There is no reason to think that any considerable number of Republicans, certainly no recognized leader, voted for Parker and Davis as representing a more conservative tendency. On the other hand, there is evidence, easily deducible from the election returns, that a great many radical Democrats, angry at the temporary self-effacement of their own wing of the party, deserted their candidates and supported Roosevelt as the candidate most nearly reflecting their own political principles and aspirations. Inasmuch as Mr. Roosevelt was enthusiastically supported by a great body of admirers in his own party, who were neither conservative nor radical by strong conviction, but ready to be carried in either direction by a powerful leader; also by the conservative rank and file because they could not do otherwise, however seriously they might distrust their candidate; and by a host of temporary recruits from the other party; his success at the polls was imposing — a popular majority of more than two and a half million votes and an electoral majority of much more than two to one, including the votes of every northern State and of two of those usually classed as southern.

It has already been carefully emphasized, in the preceding chapter, that the result of the election of 1904 was in effect, if not a mandate to the President then chosen to lead his party and the country to the enforcement of a radical programme, at least a certificate of permission to do so. He accepted the permission and acted upon it during his full term of four years. No criticism of him for so acting is just. Two consequences, which were not then foreseen, but which are now seen to have been inevitable, were the rending of the Republican party into two factions, and the organization of the mighty host of Roosevelt's followers, most of them previously indifferent as between radicalism and conservatism, into a body of eager and enthusiastic advocates of any extreme policy Mr. Roosevelt might urge, and looking to him as the one and only agent earnest enough

and strong enough to make the proposed reform effective and complete.

It was the loyalty, little short of idolatry, to Mr. Roosevelt that furnished a sufficient explanation of the prolonged attempt in the convention of 1908 to stampede it in his favor. There is in existence—it has never been published—absolutely convincing evidence of Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity in the wish that Mr. Taft should be nominated. Indeed, if there is any criticism to be made upon him in that contest it is that he transcended the bounds of propriety by his activity in Taft's behalf and by sanctioning tactics to accomplish his object which he condemned in no measured terms four years later, when the same tactics were employed against himself. The attempt to stampede the convention, whether carefully prepared in advance or spontaneous, was not prepared by him, but it was a proof of the fact that the throng of his admiring followers felt impatient and intolerant of being under any other leader, even under one chosen by the leader himself. In that respect Mr. Taft was less fortunate than the only other man in our political history who was placed in a similar situation. Van Buren also was chosen as his successor by the President, who was, like Roosevelt, a strong and domineering personality and the object of extraordinary political veneration. He too went down to defeat for a second election; but neither did Jackson turn against him, nor did Jackson's followers fail in their loyalty. Yet the two cases are so far parallel that it may be said that in neither case could any man of the same party as the retiring President have made a successful administration.

Let us consider the situation. In spite of the great popular and electoral majorities he had received, Mr. Taft was not in the ordinary sense a popular man, and did not enjoy the public confidence to a large degree. Not only were the thick-and-thin adherents of Roosevelt suspicious of his earnestness in carrying on the policies bequeathed to him, but the conservatives, in view of the fact that he was the choice of one whom they distrusted, had a more than vague apprehension that he would continue the warfare for changes which they did not approve and would prolong the period of business unrest. In short, the party which elected Taft was already divided when he took office, and there was laid upon him the hopeless task of satisfying both wings of it. At all events, that was the task he undertook and, hopeless though it was, one for which he had

unusual qualifications. For he was both a reformer and a conservative, by no means either a radical or, in the slang of the day, a "stand-patter." The task was hopeless because the radical wing of the party, created by Roosevelt, would be satisfied with nothing less than the whole programme of reform; because the other wing of the party always dreaded the next step and had not confidence in Taft's real conservatism. So the party, divided in March, 1909, remained divided up to the time of the catastrophe, in June, 1912.

It was naturally the radical wing that took the aggressive, and no time was lost in taking it. The war within the party on the President began as soon as the make-up of the Cabinet was announced. He was accused of treachery and breach of faith, if not of his pledged word, because he did not appoint certain of Mr. Roosevelt's secretaries. Irrefutable evidence exists that the charge was wholly untrue; but since it was made irresponsibly and without an attempt at proof, no one of those who were in a position to dispose of it summarily dignified it by a formal denial. Consequently those believed it who were prepared to believe anything evil of the President, and a foundation was laid for the distrust and animosity toward him that soon became chronic and widespread.

Examples might be given plentifully of the attacks made upon the President by newspapers nominally of his own party at the very outset, before the country had an opportunity to ascertain what to expect of him. Here are a few, which date from the second month of the administration — April, 1909. "Taft has surrounded himself with corporation attorneys." "Roosevelt policies are in the ditch, for sure." "Taft has made a studied effort to repudiate the things for which his predecessor stood." "The man goes about exactly as if he did not exist by the grace of another." "Roosevelt suffers from the deepest wound known to man — ingratitude."

It is the barest justice to Mr. Roosevelt to say that he had, and could have had, no part in such flings at the man whom he, more than any other, had helped to his present position. In fact the two men were then, and long afterward, carrying on a correspondence in the most friendly and even affectionate tone, in which public questions were discussed more or less freely, without a symptom of discord between them. Such intercourse was interrupted by Mr. Roosevelt's long absence on his hunting tour in Africa, but was resumed, in a more desul-

tory manner, to be sure, after his return. It must, nevertheless, be remarked as singular that, so far as is known, Mr. Roosevelt never rebuked his partisans as being over-officious, never denied accusations against the President which he knew to be untrue, nor in any way dissociated himself from the campaign which was carried on quite as much in his interest as in opposition to the President. Indeed, one journalist, as early as in the spring of 1909, announced with evident satisfaction that events were shaping themselves for a Republican defeat in the congressional elections of 1910, and then, nothing could prevent such a call for Roosevelt that he would be nominated in 1912. So far as Mr. Roosevelt himself was concerned, his policy all through the first three years of the administration was one of silence. Publicly, at least, he expressed neither approval nor disapproval of his successor's acts. The reason why he concealed his opinion must be left to conjecture. Meantime the campaign against Taft proceeded with increasing violence.

During the second term of President Roosevelt the question of the tariff was officially kept somewhat in the background. The President himself made no effort to bring it forward. He had many items on his programme which he deemed of more pressing importance. His opponents ascribed his apparent indifference to another motive, but that which is here suggested is an ample as well as a reasonable explanation. But however unmindful of the issue he and a majority of the members of Congress were, it was a very lively issue in the country. The "insurgent" group in the West, and many influential newspapers of that region, together with not a few in the East, were insistent in their "demands" for a revision of the tariff and a reduction of the rates of duty. The convention that nominated Taft could not and did not disregard the widespread sentiment. The paragraph in the platform dealing with the subject¹ should be carefully studied by those who would decide judicially whether or not the Republicans subsequently fulfilled the promise of the platform; but after they have done so there will still be two opinions on the subject. There are three chief features of the declaration: (1) The Republican party "declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff"; (2) the true principle is the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with

¹ See page 172.

reasonable profit to American industries; (3) a declaration against "excessive duties."

The platform also called for a special session of Congress at once to act on the tariff. The President accordingly summoned Congress to meet in extraordinary session on March 15. The Republican members of the House Committee on Ways and Means had been holding hearings and considering the schedules during most of the time since the election, and the bill was ready to be presented when Congress met. The membership of the Sixty-first Congress at its first meeting was made up as follows: Senate, Republicans, 60; Democrats, 32. House of Representatives, Republicans, 219; Democrats, 172. The Republicans had therefore a sufficient majority in both branches to carry their party measures, although there were even then as many as seven senators who classed themselves as Republicans who were energetically opposed to such a tariff policy as was to be expected from the leaders who controlled the Finance Committee of the Senate. Their number increased as time passed.

There was a prolonged debate upon the tariff bill in the House, which did not end until April 9, when it was passed, yeas 217, nays 161, — substantially a party vote. The discussion in the Senate occupied even more time, for the final vote did not come until July 8, when 45 votes were given for the bill and 34 against it. The conference committee acted deliberately. The House accepted its report by 195 yeas to 183 noes, twenty Republicans being in the negative. The Senate accepted it on August 5, and Congress adjourned on the same day. Its vote was yeas 47, noes 31. Seven Republicans voted no; one Democrat yes.

The Payne-Aldrich Act, as it has been called, contributed greatly to the defeat of the Republicans in 1912. Its severest critics were Republicans, who protested that the platform was understood by members of the party generally, indeed, universally, except by those who had betrayed them, as a promise of "downward" revision. As a matter of fact there were numerous reductions of duty in the act, and taken as a whole the rate of duty was somewhat lower. But it is unquestionably true that the great body of Republicans throughout the country, whether they were in favor of the Dingley rates or not, did understand that the party was pledged to a substantial reduction. Opponents of the act complained that the most objectionable duties had been maintained or increased, and that the items in

which reductions had been made were in many cases chosen to produce a false impression that it was a downward revision, but of no benefit to the consumer. On the other hand, the act was stoutly defended, but as usually happens, the defence was attributed to self-interest. President Taft, who made no secret of his wish for a decided reduction of rates, interfered little or not at all while the bill was in its progress through Congress, and later provided his enemies with a fresh count in the indictment against him, by declaring that it was the best tariff measure ever passed. But in that remark he referred not so much to the rates of duty levied, which were not satisfactory to him, as to the scientific classification of merchandise for purposes of the tariff, and to the administrative features of the act. It did, in fact, carry out explicitly the Republican platform promises collateral to the tariff issue. It introduced the principle of maximum and minimum rates as a device to furnish the government with the means to secure trade concessions from foreign countries; granted modified free trade to the Philippine Islands; gave authority to the President to appoint a tariff board to collect facts and statistics for use in framing tariff laws; made provision for a corporation tax; and created a court for customs appeals. All these collateral measures the President greatly desired. The tariff act was the only important product of the special session of Congress.

The early months of the administration saw the beginning of a fierce controversy, partly political, partly personal, which lasted many months, from which the President could not dissociate himself, in which he courageously espoused one side, and thereby earned for himself a group of unrelenting political enemies who took a leading part in accomplishing his downfall. The policy of the conservation of the natural resources of the country was one of Mr. Roosevelt's cherished schemes, and he was enthusiastically supported in it by the Chief Forester, Mr. Gifford Pinchot. Shortly before the change of administration the President withdrew from entry, location, and settlement about a million and a half acres of land in Montana and Wyoming. Upon the advice of Mr. Ballinger, the new Secretary of the Interior, President Taft cancelled the withdrawal as not authorized by existing law. It seems never to have been maintained by those who criticised the cancellation that the law did authorize the withdrawal order, but it was vehemently urged that the public good and the welfare of future genera-

tions required it to be done, law or no law. The action of Secretary Ballinger was accordingly roundly denounced; and was stoutly defended by the President. It was cited as an indication that the policies of the former President were to be abandoned. A little later serious charges were made against the Secretary of offences said to have been committed by him before he entered the Cabinet. In the previous administration he had been Commissioner of the General Land Office. In the interval between his retirement from that position and his appointment by Taft he was declared to have been connected improperly with certain Alaskan coal land claims. The matter attracted great attention in newspaper and private discussion, as well as in Washington, and the country was divided into two camps on the Ballinger question. The President sturdily defended his Secretary, and an investigation instituted by him resulted in a verdict of his innocence. But the opposition to him continued, and the investigation was stigmatized as a "white-wash." In the course of the controversy an act by Mr. Pinchot, which was held to be insubordination, led to his dismissal summarily from the office of Chief Forester. The whole incident, personal though it was to a great extent, increased the alienation from the President of the particular friends of Mr. Roosevelt, who were unitedly opposed to Ballinger. The dismissal of Mr. Pinchot did not take place until January, 1910, when Mr. Roosevelt was still absent on his African hunting tour. Nevertheless, it was intimated that Pinchot's conduct had been suggested to him by Roosevelt. Although the insinuation was manifestly untrue, in fact impossible, it served its purpose to increase the devotion of Roosevelt's followers and the opposition of his enemies. The affair was unworthy of the stir it created; but it is necessary to mention it as having had an appreciable influence upon the result of the canvass in 1912.

In the autumn of 1909 the President made an extensive speaking tour through the West. In his utterances there was no suggestion that he was not heartily in favor of and determined to carry out the policies of his predecessor. On the contrary, he adduced facts that implied that he was carrying them out; as, for example, his statistics of the prosecutions in progress against "trusts." His method of presenting problems of government, and of solving them, was different from Roosevelt's method, as the two men were different. But if the tone

in which purposes were announced was more conciliatory, it was not less resolute. Although his opponents proclaimed loudly that he had abandoned Roosevelt's policies, they did not find confirmation of the statement in his words; and his beginning a prosecution of the American Sugar Refining Company, as conducting a business in violation of the anti-trust law, was a proof that he had not entirely abandoned them.

In December, 1909, Congress met for the "long" session. The President had on his programme many measures which he wished to be passed. Although a part of the programme failed, it is quite true, as was remarked at the end of the session, that more constructive legislation was enacted than by any previous Congress since Reconstruction. Indeed, it may be questioned if the legislation of any Congress since the First, which organized the government, had a broader scope. Perhaps the most important measure passed was the railroad rate law, which found its way to the statute-book after a long agitation. It gave largely increased power to the Interstate Commerce Commission over both freight and passenger charges, and modified to a certain extent the provision of law on the "long and short haul." It greatly extended the restrictions upon common carriers, and included in that category pipe-lines, telegraphs, and telephones. A Commerce Court was established — to be abolished by the succeeding administration — for hearing and determining appeals from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Important changes were made in the laws relating to the public lands, in order to preserve such lands as contain valuable mineral deposits, or are essential to the conservation of water-power, from passing into private hands; and the rules relative to the withdrawal of tracts of the national domain from entry and settlement were improved. The law requiring the use of safety appliances on railway cars was amended and strengthened. A Bureau of Mines was established in the interest of the safety of miners. A stringent act dealing with the evil known as "white slavery" was passed. It will be observed that all the measures here enumerated were designed in one way or another to improve or protect the position of the people as a whole, or individually. They may all be classed as among the more or less direct results of the agitations of the few preceding years.

Other acts of that session, also of an important although different character should not be omitted from this incomplete

list. An enabling act was passed for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as separate States, instead of as one, closing a controversy that came over from the previous administration. It may be said here, out of the chronological order, that the act required the constitutions adopted by the conventions of the two States to be submitted to the President and to Congress for approval. Admission was not to be effective unless that approval was given. Arizona introduced into its constitution the feature of the "recall" of judges. The President emphatically opposed that principle and withheld approval. Congress at its next session passed another act, prescribing certain conditions prior to the admission either of Arizona or of New Mexico. The people of Arizona were required to vote upon the ratification of an amendment to the paragraph providing for the recall of elective officers, containing the clause "except the judiciary." They did ratify it, and in due time the President proclaimed the admission of the two States.

In addition to the enactments already mentioned was one establishing postal saving banks; also a law requiring publication of all contributions to funds for promoting the election of candidates for Congress, and the expenditures therefrom; an act for the protection of the seal fisheries in the Bering Sea, afterward superseded by an agreement with Great Britain and Japan prohibiting altogether, for a term of years, the killing of seals in the Pacific; a law further regulating immigration by specifying more definitely the classes of persons who are not to be admitted to the country; a law to protect travel at sea by requiring passenger steamships of specified capacity and length of voyage to be equipped with the instruments of wireless telegraphy; and a law introducing the practice of paroling prisoners convicted under United States law after a certain term of imprisonment.

A striking manifestation of the prevailing spirit of "insurgency" at that time was the successful campaign that was waged in the House of Representatives to curb the power of the Speaker. By gradual steps taken by men of strong will who had from time to time held the position of Speaker, a measure of control over the proceedings which was excessive, in the opinion of many persons in and out of Congress, had been assumed and exercised, not infrequently in an arbitrary manner. The Speaker appointed all committees, without asking the approval of the House, as all his predecessors for a good

part of a century had done before him, and thus had the power to organize any committee so as to promote or obstruct any measure or class of measures as to the merit of which he held a strong opinion. He was himself chairman of the Committee on Rules, which proposed to the House the conditions under which important bills should be debated. By a stretch of authority he might practically deny to a majority of the body the right to bring forward for consideration a bill to which he was opposed. Mr. Speaker Reed, indeed, once assumed that authority and thwarted a clear majority of the House who were resolved to pass a free silver bill. Another power exercised by the Speaker was that of granting — by “recognizing” a member — or refusing an opportunity to ask for unanimous consent to take up and pass a bill. Mr. Cannon justified that use of his position on the ground that he was himself a member of the House, and as such, in case of his opposition to any measure, entitled, like any other member, to object to its consideration, in other words, to refuse unanimous consent. For some years there had been a growing impatience on the part of many members at these powers, which might be dictatorial and dangerous if placed in improper hands; and now the revolt against “Cannonism” broke out. The Democrats naturally favored it, but the leaders were a large group of persistent Republican “insurgents,” and they carried their point. The reform which they effected was not thorough, though it took out of the hands of the Speaker the right to appoint the Committee on Rules, and forbade him to be a member of it. The resolution to make the committee elective was offered on March 18, 1910, by a radical Republican, and was supported by the entire body of Democrats as well as by the insurgents. After a prolonged parliamentary struggle the Speaker ruled the resolution out of order, but the House reversed his decision, thirty-five Republicans voting against it. On the final vote 191 members voted for the resolution, 156 against it. Then a Democratic member offered a resolution to depose Mr. Cannon from the speakership, but on that question the Republicans were united, and the resolution was defeated, 155 to 192. The Speaker was personally popular, and the objection to him was aimed solely at his parliamentary dictatorship. No further action was taken to limit his power, but the next House of Representatives withdrew from the Speaker all power to appoint committees, and entrusted it nominally to the whole House, but really to an

elected (by a caucus of members of the majority) Committee on Ways and Means and to the minority leader.

Other events of the same period had an influence upon the political situation, and possibly also upon the election in 1912. Two of the veteran senators on the Republican side announced their prospective retirement from the Chamber — Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, and Eugene Hale, of Maine. Each had served more than thirty years in Congress. They were both most prominent in the leadership of the Senate and were ranked among the uncompromising opponents of the innovations in Republican policy that were due to the public activities of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Aldrich for many years had had great influence in the framing of tariff acts, and was credited with an almost unrivalled store of knowledge on tariff questions. On that account he was particularly obnoxious to those Republicans who, while declaring themselves in favor of protective duties, protested against the recent tariff act. Mr. Hale shared with him the dislike of the insurgent body, in Congress and in the country, to a greater extent than any other senator, for he was a staunch and unyielding conservative. The retirement of two such men from the Senate was an event of considerable political importance.

The "high cost of living" became about this time a campaign issue, welcomed with enthusiasm by Democrats, dreaded by Republicans. "Hard times" can always be employed with effect by the opposition as a weapon to defeat the party in power. The United States was not, in 1910, suffering from hard times as that phrase is usually understood. Business was good and employment at fair wages was ample. But the prices of food, clothing, and other necessities of life were high and increasing, and it was easy to ascribe the movement to misrule by the dominant party. The cause of the existing condition was variously assigned to a dozen different causes by the eager disputants in the two parties; but those who held the tariff to blame had the ear of the public more than — for example — those who discovered a world-misfortune in an increased production of gold. That statement is fortified by the result of a bye-election in the Fourteenth Congressional District of Massachusetts, where a Democrat was elected by a rousing majority, on the tariff issue, in a strong Republican constituency.

The great event of the year, in a political sense, prior to the November elections, was the return of Colonel Roosevelt from

his African hunt. He sailed from New York on March 24, 1909, and arrived home on June 18, 1910, having closed his trip by receiving almost unexampled honors at the leading courts of Europe and in Great Britain. There was extraordinary interest in the country to learn what the ex-President thought of the administration of his successor, an interest that was not to be gratified for a long time. Perhaps the student of politics will never know his real sentiments at the time of his return and for many months afterward, since it is possible to adduce equally good and equally first-hand evidence on either side of the question. There is no doubt that Roosevelt and Taft were exchanging cordially friendly letters during that period, and Mr. Roosevelt paid a visit to the President at his summer home in Beverly. There is, on the other hand, no doubt that Mr. Roosevelt was in close conference with leading men of the faction that was heaping abuse upon the President and accusing him of treachery to the benefactor to whom he owed his office. His political purposes, if at the time he had formed any such purposes, were, so far as appears, unknown to any one. In February, 1910, the President of the New York State League of Republican Clubs quoted Mr. Roosevelt as having said, before his departure for Africa, that he was not a candidate for senator or for mayor, nor yet for the presidency in 1912; and he added, as of the time when he reported that statement, that Roosevelt's friendship for the President was as clear and cordial as at any other time. If the significance of the remark be understood as referring to personal as distinguished from political sentiments, it was undoubtedly true.

While the steamship on which he was returning to the United States was still at sea, Mr. Roosevelt sent a wireless message to the effect that "he will have nothing to say in the immediate future about politics, and will hold no interview whatever on the subject with any one." Whether or not he was able to adhere strictly to the spirit of that resolution in the privacy of conversation with his many political friends who made pilgrimages to Oyster Bay, it is certain that he made no public utterances on national affairs, and that if he did express opinions confidentially to those friends they loyally observed his wish that they should keep the fact to themselves. They neither quoted him as approving their course nor shifted any responsibility for their conduct to his shoulders. But his reticence was not and was not promised to be of long duration. There was a di-

vision of Republican sentiment in New York State, as there was throughout the country, and he could not hold back from joining in the fray. At the solicitation of Governor Hughes he undertook to promote the system of popular primary elections and other reforms urged by the governor. Accordingly he became a candidate for temporary chairman of the New York Republican State Convention. The State Central Committee proposed Vice-President Sherman for the position, and a fierce contest was thus precipitated. An attempt was made to create the impression that the President favored Mr. Sherman, but he promptly denied the truth of the rumor, and wrote, among other things, that when the suggestion came to him that Mr. Roosevelt should be the temporary chairman he not only acquiesced, but "it did not occur to me that any one would oppose it"; that he first learned of the Sherman movement from the newspapers; and that he had done all he could to prevent a contest.

But there was a contest. The State Committee was defeated, Mr. Roosevelt was made chairman, his friends controlled the convention and nominated the candidates. The split in the party — like that in other States — was not disruption, but it left one faction, the "Old Guard," sore and unenthusiastic for immediate party success. It became evident as the canvass proceeded that the real question in the New York election was the predominance of Roosevelt in the politics of the State. That gentleman, roused to activity, made a speaking tour through the Middle West, where his utterances were so radical that the cynics accused him of having "stolen Bryan's thunder."

Maine, in September, led the way in the Republican reverses in the elections of 1910. A Democratic governor and legislature were chosen, also two of the four congressmen. Local issues, in Maine that of the prohibitory law, brought about or made more complete the Republican defeats in several States, but it is doubtful if the general result would have been reversed if those local issues had not so pertinaciously conspired against a single party. The Democratic candidates for governor were elected in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, North Dakota, Colorado, and Oregon, all more or less trustworthy Republican States. In no less than nine States the legislatures chosen made certain the election of Democratic senators to succeed Republicans, thus reducing the nominal Republican majority by 18 and, considering the extremely independent atti-

tude of the insurgents, virtually wiping it out altogether. The official figures, after the senators were elected, gave the numbers as 51 Republicans; 41 Democrats. The House of Representatives suffered a revolution. The Republican majority of 40 disappeared, and the new House consisted of 223 Democrats and 168 Republicans — a Democratic majority of 55.

One of the most important events of the election, in its bearing upon the future political history of the country, was the election of the President of Princeton University as Governor of New Jersey. Mr. Woodrow Wilson, a southerner by birth, professor and afterward president of a university, had never before been a candidate for public office. Political conditions in New Jersey had been for many years regarded as intolerable by a large and increasing number of the voters on both sides; and although neither party was free from blame in the matter, it was the Republicans who were then in power, and were therefore held responsible, if not for introducing the evil, at least for not having removed it. Mr. Wilson, as the Democratic candidate for governor, made a stirring and successful campaign and, in a State which gave Taft, two years before, a plurality of nearly 83,000, obtained a plurality of 49,000 over his Republican opponent. His achievement as a campaigner was followed by even greater success in extorting from a reluctant legislature the enactments which he advocated and the defeat of men and measures that he opposed. He thus became in a short time one of the most conspicuous figures in the political world, and some political prophets already named him "the next President of the United States."

However little influence the real merits of the Taft administration may have had in determining the issue of the ensuing presidential election, it is but just to mention certain items that must be entered to its credit. Very early in the administration an appointment was made in one of the western States on the recommendation of the governor, who boasted openly that he had obtained it over the wishes of the two senators. Thereupon the President revoked the appointment, in order to make it known that he would not be a consenting party to factional contests in any State. It was an incidental result of his action in this case that the governor became one of the most violent opponents of Mr. Taft when his term was expiring. The President's opposition to the spoils system in the civil service was of long standing, and at no time was he

accused even of lukewarmness in favor of a non-partisan administration of that service. He took a long step in advance when he transferred the second- and third-class postmasterships to the classified service. His lack of extreme partisanship was exhibited conspicuously in his judicial appointments, for he promoted Mr. Justice White, a Louisiana Democrat, to the position of Chief Justice, and added two other southern Democrats to the court to fill vacancies. The designation of Governor Hughes to the bench, which was generally applauded, was, of course, not a non-partisan act.

During the final session of the Sixty-first Congress a new grievance against the administration made its appearance. The Postmaster-General strongly urged an increase of the postage rates on certain "second-class matter." The project was not new. Successive postmasters-general had asserted, backing up their statement with official statistics, that the rate of one cent a pound was a losing rate, and the sole cause of the postal deficit. But Mr. Hitchcock's bow was not drawn at a venture. His arrow had a definite aim at a group of cheap monthly magazines with a minimum of reading matter and a great bulk of advertising pages. At any rate, that was the way it was interpreted in many quarters. Some of those magazines had been conspicuously active and zealous in attacking the "trusts" and prominent "plutocrats" and in advocacy of the current progressive policies. It was bluntly charged that the movement to increase the postal rate was motivated and backed by the "interests" that would put a stop to the progressive campaign, and assisted by the "magazine trust," in order to render the publication of the cheap magazines unprofitable — an accusation that carried with it an implication that the administration was hopelessly reactionary. In the end the attempt to raise the postal rate failed.

The most important event in the larger politics of the year 1911 was the ultimately abortive attempt to establish reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. The movement had its origin in that feature of the Payne-Aldrich tariff act of 1909 which provided maximum and minimum rates of duty according to the liberality of the tariff laws of other countries toward the admission of American products. Canada granted to Great Britain a preferential rate on a large variety of imports from the mother country. It became, therefore, a fair object for the maximum rates under the new law. But the trade of Canada

with the United States was exceedingly large in spite of the hostile tariffs of both countries, and there was really no desire on the part of any one to obstruct it further by heavier import duties. President Taft, in March, 1910, sounded Mr. Fielding, the Canadian Minister of Finance, on the subject, and found him favorably disposed to make some concessions that would enable this government to grant the minimum rates to the Dominion. Subsequently the two men met at Albany, and the suggestion of a reciprocity arrangement was made and received with favor. Representatives of both governments met in the autumn, and after long conferences reached an agreement on January 26, 1911. In brief, it provided for free trade between the two countries in most of the natural products and raw materials of manufacture, and substantial reductions of duties on a considerable list of manufactured goods. The President sent the agreement to Congress at once. Its form was skilfully chosen. It was not a treaty or convention, the ratification of which would require the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, the House of Representatives having no voice in the matter at that stage; yet it would not be effective until an act to carry it into effect should be passed by both branches. It was an agreement in identical language that both governments should endeavor to obtain from their legislatures the modifications of their tariffs proposed.

Opposition to the measure developed instantly. The extreme advocates of a protective tariff were against it as a matter of course, and they were joined by a great body of farmers in the Northwest who feared the competition of the Canadian grain and other agricultural products. The farmers were supported by the insurgent congressmen from that region, who were in favor of a low tariff, but not as applied to their local products. The Democrats generally favored the measure, and so did many Republicans. Except in interested and official circles the movement was received either with manifestations of approval or with indifference. The bill to carry the agreement into effect so far as the United States was concerned was debated for about a fortnight, and was then passed on February 14 by a vote of 221 to 93. The negative votes came almost altogether from the Republican side of the House. Only eighteen days of the session, and of the term of the Sixty-first Congress, remained, and the bill was not brought to a vote in the Senate.

The President was most earnest in the matter of Canadian reciprocity and summoned Congress to meet in special session on April 4. The new House of Representatives was strongly Democratic, as has been noted, and in the Senate the group of insurgent senators held the balance of power, which they exercised much more frequently in opposition to the party to which they were nominally attached than in its favor. The bill to make the agreement effective was introduced at once, promptly reported to the House, debated from April 13 to April 20, and then passed by a vote of 267 to 89, a division that closely resembled that in the preceding Congress, in that the minority consisted chiefly of Republicans, many of whom nevertheless supported the bill. The Senate passed it by a vote of 53 to 27. Twelve "regular" and twelve "insurgent" Republicans were in the negative.

The action, or rather the failure to act, on the agreement by the Canadian Parliament is not a part of American political history, yet the connection of American public men with the result cannot be omitted from the record. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the premier under whose leadership the Dominion Cabinet consented to the agreement, had long been in favor of the reciprocity policy, and so was the Liberal majority of the House of Commons. Sir Wilfrid seems to have entertained no doubt of his ability to carry the measure through Parliament, particularly since it had at the outset not a little support from members of the Conservative party. But Mr. Borden, the leader of the Opposition, saw his opportunity to perform the appropriate duty of an opposition, to oppose, and made the most of it. The most formidable campaign of obstruction in the parliamentary history of the continent was organized. There is no limitation of debate in the Canadian House of Commons; there were ninety Conservative members of the body; and a speech, as long and tedious as he could make it, was expected from each of them. Sir Wilfrid, unable to bring the bill to a vote, was compelled to yield at last. He dissolved Parliament and ordered a general election.

It is probable that the government would have suffered defeat in any event, since it aroused the determined opposition of those interests in Canada that upheld the "national policy," that is, the system of protection, as essential to the well-being of the country. Moreover, many elements of discontent had developed during the long years of Liberal ascendancy. But

the victory of Mr. Borden was made certain by the adroit use of an appeal to Canadian patriotism, in two forms. Giving tariff favors to the United States was withdrawing favors already granted to the mother country. More important, it was vehemently urged that entering into the arrangement with this country was the first fatal step on the road that led to commercial subjection, and ultimately to annexation to the big republic. That was a triple appeal to national self-interest, patriotism, and fear. Much was made of one or two — there were hardly more — flamboyant speeches by Americans, which were taken as evidence that there was really a movement on foot to seize Canada, and that the reciprocity agreement was preliminary to it. Yet the speeches referred to were made by persons who were not in official or even party relations with the administration. The President, in a letter which was made public, declared that the agreement had no political significance, that no thought of future annexation was in the mind of the negotiators on either side, and “that Canada is now, and will remain, a political unit.” Nevertheless, the creators of Canadian suspicion caught up and repeated, as a refutation of the foregoing statement, a remark by the President, in one of his western speeches, that “Canada is at the parting of the ways,” a remark that, whatever it does mean, had in it no suggestion of future annexation. The patriotic campaign was successful. Mr. Borden was returned to Parliament in the September elections at the head of a majority of more than sixty opponents of reciprocity, and the policy was dropped.

The Democratic majority of the House of Representatives lost no time in letting its tariff purposes become known. Bills to reduce or abrogate the duties on many articles used by farmers, — “the farmers’ free list,” — a new wool and woollens tariff, and amendments to the cotton, chemical, steel, and machinery schedules, were passed, in the Senate, by the help of practically the whole body of progressive senators, were all vetoed by the President, and failed to pass over the veto. An act was passed apportioning representatives among the States according to the Census of 1910.

An important incident in the anti-trust campaign, at this time, the winter of 1910, — was the decision of the Supreme Court in the appealed cases of the American Tobacco Company and the Standard Oil Company, which companies were ordered to be dissolved. The judgments, which were delivered by

Chief Justice White, introduced the principle of the "rule of reason" in interpreting the "Sherman" act. That law condemns combinations and contracts "in restraint of trade" unequivocally, and attempted or accomplished monopoly indiscriminately. The Court held, however, in effect, that since the law applied to all kinds of contracts and combinations, it necessarily called for the exercise of judgment, and "that the criterion to be resorted to in any given case for the purpose of ascertaining whether violations of the section have been committed is the rule of reason guided by the established law and by the plain duty to enforce the provisions of the act." Eight of the nine justices concurred in the judgments, which were extremely displeasing to the advocates of uncompromising measures against all trusts, and led to violent political attacks upon the Court. Unsuccessful attempts were made to amend the law so as to apply its principles without exception to all combinations, eliminating "the rule of reason."

During the final session of the Sixty-first Congress, in January, 1911, the National Republican Progressive League was formed. Among its members and officers were nine senators, thirteen representatives, and five western governors, all of whom were nominally Republicans. Its political programme included the direct popular election of United States senators; popular primary elections in lieu of the caucus; direct election of delegates to national conventions; the initiative, referendum, and recall; and stringent laws against corrupt practices in elections. The most of those measures, if not all of them, were at that time hardly recognized as leading aspirations of the Republican party. In fact there was truth in the remark of one newspaper that the programme was "substantially identical, so far as it goes, with that of the now defunct Populist party." The League made no secret of its opposition to Taft. That the breach of 1912 was foreseen as a possibility in the spring of 1911, and that in some quarters it was contemplated with equanimity, is shown by a sentence in the May number of a magazine devoted to the Progressive cause: "It requires no very vivid imagination to see the Progressives in that convention, baffled in their efforts to control the party, marching out of the hall to form a convention of their own."

The League did not formally "endorse" any candidate for the presidency, but did let it be known that many of the members regarded Senator La Follette as the "logical" candidate.

Mr. La Follette, in June, announced his candidacy and his intention "to battle to the end with the 'intrenched army' of President Taft." Mr. Roosevelt gave no sign of his own intentions or preferences, but did give out, in April, that he was "not a candidate," and that if any of his real friends were to seek to make him a candidate they would do him a "cruel injustice." Still later, in December, he announced that he would not support any man for the nomination, neither Mr. Taft nor any one else, and that he never gave Mr. Taft any offer or pledge of support. "As for himself," it was declared in a Philadelphia newspaper devoted to his fortunes, "Colonel Roosevelt is not a candidate and has not been." He had repeatedly discouraged attempts to bring him forward. "He says, and wishes the statement to be accepted at its full value and unequivocal meaning, that he desires talk of his supposed candidacy to cease."

The President made an extensive tour of the country during the autumn of 1911 — a tour which involved thirteen thousand miles of travel and included visits to Seattle and Los Angeles on the Pacific. He made more than two hundred speeches in about half as many cities. Although he addressed sympathetic audiences he did not delude himself with the idea that all was well with him politically. Indeed, at the close of his journey he let it be known by a semi-jocular, semi-serious remark that he expected defeat in the election of the next year.

It was an "off-year" in politics. That is, there were no important State elections, and the result of those that took place was indecisive. The Republicans recovered the legislatures of New York and New Jersey, but suffered a severe defeat in Ohio. Maryland elected a Republican governor, but Massachusetts reëlected Governor Foss, the Democratic candidate. National issues played a subordinate part in most of the States mentioned. Consequently the division in the Republican party, which was notorious, did not make itself manifest at the polls in November. Tammany, in New York; resentment in certain quarters of Governor Wilson's energetic management of the New Jersey legislature; the much-criticised candidacy of a Republican "boss" in Ohio; and other local issues in the other States fully account for the action of the voters.

The second session of the Sixty-second Congress began on December 4, 1911, and ended on the 12th of the following August. It was comparatively fruitless of important general

legislation, as is usually true of the "long" session preceding a presidential canvass. As before, the Democrats had no difficulty in obtaining a majority for their own party measures in either branch. Consequently the fiction that the House was Democratic and the Senate Republican does not account for the meagre toll of enactment. An eight-hour-law for government employés, an act for the government and management of the Panama Canal when it should be finished, and the submission to the State legislatures of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the popular election of senators, were the leading successful measures of the session. The Panama Canal act introduced the principle of the free use of the waterway by American vessels engaged in the "coastwise" trade, — that is, for ships sailing between such ports as New York and Seattle, — a provision which was abrogated during the next administration. Bills were also passed by both Houses reducing import duties in the wool, cotton, and steel schedules, all of which were supported by nearly all the Progressive Republican senators. They were all vetoed by the President. Some of them were passed by the House over the veto, but all failed in the Senate.

At the beginning of the year 1912 the situation in the Republican party seemed to be of the worst. Mr. La Follette was delivering a series of speeches in which he advocated all the constitutional innovations which are distinctively known as "Progressive," and assailed the President with virulence. The President, with his back to the wall, as he himself expressed it, declared that "nothing but death can keep me out of the fight now." Mr. Roosevelt, who, in December, had almost impatiently demanded that all talk of his candidacy should cease, in the middle of January let it be known to his friends through a Pittsburgh editor, his supporter, that he would not desert the Progressive cause, and that he would be found fighting side by side with them to the finish. At the end of the same month he made a public explanation that his statement, in 1904, that he would not accept another nomination really meant that he would not accept such a nomination while holding the office of President. "It had no application whatever to the candidacy of a man who was not at the time in office, whether he had or had not been President before." In February there came to him the famous request from seven Republican governors that he accept the nomination. They were the governors of West Virginia, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Wyoming, Michigan,

Kansas, and Missouri. They expressed their belief that a large majority of the Republican voters of the country favored his nomination, and a large majority of the people favored his election; that his candidacy would insure success; that "you represent, as no other man represents, those principles and policies upon which we must appeal for a majority of the votes of the American people, and which, in our opinion, are necessary for the happiness and prosperity of the country." On February 25 Mr. Roosevelt replied. "I will accept the nomination," he wrote, "if it is tendered to me, and I will adhere to this decision until the convention has expressed its preference."

Meanwhile, early in February, Senator La Follette suffered a severe nervous collapse which became manifest while he was making a speech in Philadelphia, and as a result of his condition some of his most prominent supporters transferred their allegiance to Mr. Roosevelt, to whose fortunes, indeed, they had always been attached. Mr. La Follette refused to withdraw his candidacy, and his friends were extremely resentful toward Roosevelt himself. His campaign manager published a statement that it was by the direct encouragement of the ex-President and that of his friends that Mr. La Follette had entered the field, that he had prepared the way for a successful Progressive canvass, and that Mr. Roosevelt's course was not giving La Follette "a square deal."

The factional antagonisms in the Republican party in the spring of 1912 clearly indicated that it had ceased to be in a real sense a single party. The two wings of the party were no longer fighting a common enemy, their traditional opponent, but were hurling at each other accusations and vituperative phrases exceeding in intensity of violence all that had been said against the Democrats. A volume might be filled with extracts from the speeches of public men and from the newspaper press to show the heated condition of the public mind, but this is no place for them. One specimen from each side, and those by no means the most savage in tone, will suffice. President Taft, in a speech before the New York Republican Clubs, on Lincoln's birthday, referred to those "who look upon the present situation as one of evil and corruption and as the tyranny of concentrated wealth," and who undertake to pull down the pillars of the temple of freedom and representative government, as "political emotionalists and neurotics." A Philadelphia newspaper supporting Mr. Roosevelt retorted, in

denunciation of the President, that what the Progressives "at first took for temporary weakness they have now discovered to be political paranoia." So each faction was — charitably — ascribing the conduct of the other to insanity, which is an unavoidable mental state, whether in an individual or in a party organization.

It was not all vituperation. The Progressives realized that victory was not to be achieved by passion alone. The President had been elected by a united party, and a reason was required why the confidence originally reposed in him should be withdrawn. Such reason was not necessary for all who styled themselves Progressives. There was a large number of men in all the northern States whose opinions may be thus summarized: "President Roosevelt aroused the country to the imperative need of certain reforms. Owing to his limitation, by his own act, to two terms of the presidency, his full progressive programme could not be carried into effect during his incumbency of that office. In order to insure its completion he chose Mr. Taft as his successor, and by his influence secured his nomination. The people, trusting to his judgment, believing that Taft shared the views and would continue the policies of his predecessor, elected him. They did not entrust to him his own interpretation of the condition of the country, the temper of the people, and the extent and limitation of the legislation required; they gave him a mandate to carry on the policies of the Roosevelt administration as Roosevelt himself would have done. In so far as he has failed to efface himself and substitute Roosevelt's judgment for his own, he is a traitor and an ingrate toward his 'creator.'"

Both those who took that peculiar view of the continuing authority of an ex-President, and those who realized that sound reasons must be presented for refusing to a President the usual renomination, were vague in their specifications of his shortcomings. They could not allege that there had been less vigor in the prosecution of the trusts than there had been in the previous administration, either in the number of suits or in the vigilance of the Department of Justice. If they asked why this trust or that was not indicted, precisely the same question might have been asked four years earlier. Moreover, the list of social and business reforms urged and accomplished under Taft was as long and as important as stood to the credit of Roosevelt; and where there had been failures they were to be charged against Congress and not against the President.

The truth was that wholly aside from his acts his Republican opponents suspected that the attitude of his mind was less radical than that of Roosevelt; and in that suspicion they were undoubtedly correct. Entertaining it, they were justified in their opposition to him. Furthermore, they were justified in turning to Roosevelt, for in their opinion, in which also they were correct, he was the only man who could be trusted to carry out his own policies. What may, with some reserve, be taken for Mr. Roosevelt's reasons for opposing Taft, are to be found in an article in the "Outlook" in February, 1912, before the extraordinary outbreak of passion on the one side and the other. For although the article does not appear as the work of Mr. Roosevelt, his relation of contributing editor to the periodical at least suggests that it would not have been printed without consultation with him. There were three counts in the indictment against the President: "that he has allowed himself to become identified in the public mind with those elements in his party which have been frankly opposed to progress"; "the people have come to regard the President as being interested more in the machinery of government than in the promotion of human welfare"; "the people have come to feel that President Taft is primarily an interpreter of laws rather than an administrator of laws." It all comes to a criticism of the bent of his mind, and implies — if, indeed, it was approved by the contributing editor — that Roosevelt found that he had been mistaken in his understanding of a man with whom he had been on terms of intimacy ever since 1890, when they were both officers of the government, in Washington, a period of more than twenty years.

The complete antagonism of their minds is illustrated by Roosevelt's speech in Columbus, February 21, before the Ohio Constitutional Convention, proposing the "recall of judicial decisions," and Taft's reply to it. But it is needless to follow the wordy warfare, which became more and more rancorous as the canvass proceeded, both before and after the sessions of the nominating conventions, until the election itself, and was characterized by far more recklessness of language on the part of the newspapers and of the irresponsible stump speakers than on that of the two chief controversialists.

Among the Progressive measures popular at the time was that of primary elections as a substitute for the caucus and the convention; and a favorite feature of the proposed modification

of the political machinery was the "preferential presidential primary," by means of which the members of a party in a State were to express by direct voting their choice of a candidate for President. The legislatures of several of the States had enacted laws for such expressions of preference. The idea was comparatively novel and had not been carefully thought out in any State. There was no uniformity in the laws, and one and all they developed defects. Some of them were so drawn that it was easy for adroit politicians to render it impossible for the members of a party to register their preferences freely. In other States the drafting was so loose — as in Massachusetts and Maryland — that a majority of the voters could express a preference for one candidate, and at the same election choose delegates pledged to the fortunes of the other. Inasmuch as in eleven of the twelve States in which primaries were held the result was adverse to Taft, and in nine of them strongly in favor of Roosevelt, the partisans of the former President naturally and justifiably made the most of it.

The State of North Dakota led off in the voting, on March 19, and gave a surprising result. Mr. La Follette had a plurality of more than ten thousand over Roosevelt, and Taft was "nowhere," — his total vote being less than four per cent of those cast for the three candidates. The other primary elections continued until May. There are some minor differences in the returns as published in the almanacs and year-books, but the following table is sufficiently accurate. It shows not only the vote for the several candidates and the total vote cast, but also the combined vote for Roosevelt and Taft at the election in November: —

STATE	PRIMARY ELECTIONS				NOVEMBER
	Roosevelt	Taft	La Follette	Total	Total
California.....	138,563	69,345	45,876	253,784	287,549
Illinois.....	266,917	127,481	42,692	437,090	631,091
Maryland.....	29,194	26,068	..	55,262	112,744
Massachusetts....	83,099	86,722	2,058	171,879	299,176
Nebraska.....	46,795	13,241	16,785	76,921	127,124
New Jersey.....	61,297	44,034	3,464	108,795	234,245
North Dakota.....	23,669	1,876	34,123	59,868	47,460
Ohio.....	165,809	118,362	15,570	299,741	506,403
Oregon.....	28,905	20,517	22,491	71,913	72,273
Pennsylvania.....	298,962	193,063	..	492,025	720,751
South Dakota.....	35,637	9,843	17,821	63,391	57,630
Wisconsin.....	628	47,514	133,354	181,496	189,539

A study of the table reveals some interesting features. The result in California, Oregon, and Wisconsin appears, comparing the total vote at the primaries and that at the subsequent election, to have been a fair expression of the will of the Republican voters, save that in Wisconsin those voters did not have a chance to vote for Roosevelt, because his name was not on the ballot. It may have been the fact that only 628 voters in that State were in favor of him, but it does not seem probable. It was openly charged that Democrats in large numbers took part in the Republican primaries in Oregon and the two Dakotas. The accusation derives some probability from the fact that twelve thousand more votes were cast in North Dakota in the primaries than in the keenly contested election in November, and more than five thousand more in South Dakota. Any other explanation leaves much to be explained.

The natural criticism upon the result in the other seven States is quite different. The primaries did not give a clear expression of the opinions of the Republican voters, because about two of every five did not take the opportunity to record his wish. The aggregate of votes at the primaries was 1,641,713, and at the election 2,631,514, — almost a million more. It is a commonplace in political campaigning that there is a great advantage to a party in the creation, or the existence, of a popular impression that it is having things all its own way, that "it is all over but the shouting." Such an impression among Republicans undoubtedly existed in the spring of 1912, and while it does not account for the general result in the choice of delegates to the national convention and in the subsequent election, it easily accounts for the sweeping character of the revolution in the party and the unexampled thoroughness of its defeat.

The Republican National Convention was called on December 12, 1911, to meet on the 18th of June following. In all the States there were exciting struggles between the opposing factions for the choice of delegates. Certain forms of political tactics which are fair and honorable, or unfair and dishonorable, according to your association with the faction that practises them or with that which suffers from them, were employed, possibly by each faction, as it had the opportunity: whence many contested elections the decision of which gave a foundation for the accusation of a fraudulent nomination — an accusation that would have been made by the other faction if the decisions had been against it.

The situation in the southern States was scandalous, — had been so for many years. In about half of them the Republican party was practically non-existent, yet under the uniform practice each State was entitled to twice as many delegates as its representation in Congress. Under that practice South Carolina, which gave Taft 3963 votes in 1908, was entitled to two more delegates than Connecticut, which gave him 112,815. The average vote for Taft in ten of the southern States, in 1908, was less than 4500 to a congressional district. In fact the Republican organization was maintained chiefly with a view to give its managers the offices, or the disposal of them, in the control of the national administration. The South was thus an attractive field to be worked by the agents or supporters of rival candidates for the presidential nomination, had been successfully worked on more than one occasion, was so worked in 1908. Undoubtedly the "organization" or the "machine," in those States was in the hands of the "regulars," who were, as beneficiaries of the existing administration, and anxious to retain what they had, favorable to the renomination of Taft, and in a position to control the local conventions. It was therefore obviously the indicated strategy of the supporters of Roosevelt to organize as many bolts and bring about as many contests for seats in the convention as possible; just as the opponents of the nomination of Mr. Taft had done four years before.

In accordance with custom the National Committee met some days before the date set for the convention, to prepare a temporary roll of delegates. That brought before the committee the question of contested seats, which were more numerous than ever before. A large number of them were so obviously trumped up that they were not pressed, but there were also many which gave room for reasonable doubt where justice lay. In making the temporary roll the committee decided nearly all the contests in favor of the Taft delegates. The Roosevelt party maintained that if the decisions had been justly made the organization of the convention would have been controlled by them and the whole course of the subsequent canvass would have been different. The subject of the contested seats is considered later; but it is as impossible now as it was when the convention was in session to ascertain where the ultimate truth lies.

A brief summary of the facts relating to the Republican

National Convention of 1912 will indicate the difficulty of presenting a clear and unchallengeable account of its proceedings within permissible limits of space. It was in session five days, June 18-22, and a little more than thirty-five hours in all. The official report of its proceedings fills a volume of 450 pages. On the first day the temporary chairman was elected, after a heated contest, in which the whole question of the temporary roll was the matter at issue. The wrangle on the same point was continued and concluded on the second day, after which the usual committees were appointed. The Committee on Credentials not being ready to report, no business was transacted on the third day. Consideration of that report and action upon contested seats occupied the whole of the fourth day and a part of the fifth, so that it was not until the middle of the last day of the convention that a permanent organization was effected. The adoption of the platform and the nomination of candidates — the real work of the convention — were the business of the few remaining hours.

To recur to the beginning of the session, an attempt was made immediately upon the opening to amend the temporary roll by substituting the names of seventy-two contestants, in eleven States, for those upon that roll. The motion was declared out of order, the first business being the choice of a temporary chairman. The roll — the temporary roll already mentioned — was called amid great confusion and shouts of "robbers," "thieves," "steam-roller," etc., with the following result: Elihu Root, of New York, had 558 votes; Francis E. McGovern, of Wisconsin, 501; scattering and not voting, 19. Governor McGovern was the candidate of the La Follette men, adopted by the supporters of Roosevelt. Mr. Root, on taking the chair, was greeted with cries of "Receiver of stolen goods!" In the opening of his address he referred, without partisanship, to the contest between the factions; but the rest of the speech was such as might have been delivered previous to the factional division of the party. Lafayette B. Gleason, of New York, was made temporary secretary, and several days later the temporary organization was made permanent.

Immediately after the business of organizing was completed, the motion for an amendment of the temporary roll was renewed, but was postponed until the next day, when a six hours' debate, equally divided between the two sides, was agreed upon. The point of order was raised that no delegate whose seat was con-

tested should be allowed to vote in the decision of the right to any contested seat; but the point was overruled. At the end of the debate the motion for a revision of the roll was defeated, 567 to 507, and the usual committees were then appointed. The most of the fourth and fifth days of the session were consumed in hearing and acting upon the reports of the Committee on Credentials on the contested seats. Although the action of the Convention was made the justification of the resolution of the Roosevelt faction to withdraw from participation in the further proceedings, there was not then, and of course there never can be, evidence so conclusive as to enable a candid and unbiassed student to prove absolutely whether justice was or was not done. Nevertheless, it will not be useless to make a brief analysis of the cases.

As nearly as can be made out, from the somewhat confused reports, there were in all 210 nominally contested seats in the full convention of 1078 members. Of the whole number, 108 were abandoned by the contestants, and were not even brought before the National Committee. All but two of those abandoned contests were in southern States — 24 from Georgia, 14 from Louisiana, 16 from Virginia, 10 from Florida. The evident purpose was to have as many contests as possible to be ready for contingencies. The Committee on Credentials passed separately upon the remaining 102 contests, and made reports upon them. No less than 62 again were from southern States: as to 40 of the whole number there was no minority report; the action of the committee and of the convention was unanimous. That leaves 62 as the maximum number on which a grievance seems possible. The Committee on Credentials presented statements in detail of the evidence on which it made its reports upon those contests. In the cases of 36 of them the minority made no contradictory statements, but contented themselves with protests against certain members of the committee, three of them as being chosen by delegates whose seats were contested, and five as having been members of the National Committee which prepared the temporary roll. In none of those cases did they dispute the statements on which the majority of the committee reached its decision, but in every one they reported that the contestant was entitled to the seat. Of course that does not make it certain that the statements made by the majority members were uniformly true, and that the decision was right, but it does create a presumption to that effect.

There are now left 26 of the total of 210 threatened contests that had substance enough to elicit contradictory statements by the committeemen representing the two candidates. Mr. Root had 38 majority over all others in the election of temporary chairman. If all the 26 really contested seats had been awarded to the contestants and had all voted for McGovern, he would have had 527 to Root's 532, and Root would still have been elected. The statement in that form assumes what can be neither proved nor disapproved, that every one of the 26 cases that were reported with "statements of facts," was wrongly decided, and that there was no merit in any of the 36 cases in regard to which the minority presented no contradiction of the statements by the majority of the committee.

The most of the genuine contests turned upon circumstances in the conduct of conventions, that in Texas on "boss-rule." The California case, the most interesting of all, and that which gave the Roosevelt men their most useful grievance, arose from these facts: The call for the National Convention provided that delegates should be chosen in conformity with State laws, but "that in no State can an election be so held as to prevent the delegates from any congressional district and their alternates being selected by the Republican electors of that district." After the call was issued the California legislature passed a law providing for the election of all the delegates to a party convention to which the State was entitled by primaries on a single ticket. At the primaries a full set of Roosevelt delegates was chosen over the Taft ticket, by a majority of about 77,000. The Republicans of the Fourth District then held a separate election, and chose Taft delegates. It was a fine question, capable of being reasonably decided either way, whether the State of California could reimpose upon a Republican National Convention the "unit rule," which it had deliberately and forever discarded in 1880, or whether the Republicans of the Fourth California District could defy and override the law of a "sovereign" State. Two votes only were at stake, but the delegates lined up for the most part as party men do on contested seats in a legislature. The vote was the closest during the entire sessions of the convention. The Taft delegates were seated, 542 to 529.

Immediately after the work of constituting the permanent convention was completed, the following statement from Theodore Roosevelt was read by a Kansas delegate: —

A clear majority of the delegates honestly elected to this convention were chosen by the people to nominate. Under the direction, and with the encouragement of Mr. Taft, the majority of the National Committee, by the so-called "steam roller" methods, and with scandalous disregard of every principle of elementary honesty and decency, stole eighty or ninety delegates, putting on the temporary roll-call a sufficient number of fraudulent delegates to defeat the legally expressed will of the people, and to substitute a dishonest for an honest majority.

The convention has now declined to purge the roll of the fraudulent delegates placed thereon by the defunct National Committee, and the majority which thus endorsed fraud was made a majority only because it included the fraudulent delegates themselves, who all sat as judges on one another's cases. If these fraudulent votes had not thus been cast and counted, the convention would have been purged of their presence. This action makes the convention in no proper sense any longer a Republican convention representing the real Republican party. Therefore I hope the men elected as Roosevelt delegates will now decline to vote on any matter before the convention. I do not release any delegate from his honorable obligation to vote for me if he votes at all, but under the actual conditions, I hope that he will not vote at all.

The convention as now composed has no claim to represent the voters of the Republican party. It represents nothing but successful fraud in overriding the will of the rank and file of the party. Any man nominated by the convention as now constituted would be merely the beneficiary of this successful fraud; it would be deeply discreditable to any man to accept the convention's nomination under these circumstances, and any man thus accepting it would have no claim to the support of any Republican on party grounds, and would have forfeited the right to ask the support of any honest man of any party on moral grounds.

During the further proceedings of the convention the Roosevelt delegates for the most part abstained from voting, in accordance with the foregoing statement.

The Committee on Resolutions reported the following platform: —

The Republican party, assembled by its representatives in national convention, declares its unchanging faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people. We renew our allegiance to the principles of the Republican party and our devotion to the cause of Republican institutions established by the fathers.

It is appropriate that we should now recall with a sense of veneration and gratitude the name of our first great leader, who was

nominated in this city, and whose lofty principles and superb devotion to his country are an inspiration to the party he honored — Abraham Lincoln.

In the present state of public affairs we should be inspired by his broad statesmanship and by his tolerant spirit toward men.

The Republican party looks back on its record with pride and satisfaction and forward to its new responsibilities with hope and confidence. Its achievements in government constitute the most luminous pages in our history. Our greatest national advance has been made during the years of its ascendancy in public affairs. It has been genuinely and always a party of progress; it has never been either stationary or reactionary. It has gone from the fulfilment of one great pledge to the fulfilment of another in response to the public need and to the popular will.

We believe in our self-controlled representative democracy, which is a government of laws, not of men, and in which order is the prerequisite of progress. The principles of constitutional government, which make provisions for orderly and effective expression of the popular will, for the protection of civil liberty and the rights of men and for the interpretation of the law by an untrammelled and independent judiciary, have proved themselves capable of sustaining the structure of a government which, after more than a century of development, embraces one hundred millions of people, scattered over a wide and diverse territory, but bound by common purpose, common ideals and common affection to the Constitution of the United States.

Under the Constitution and the principles asserted and vitalized by it the United States has grown to be one of the great civilized and civilizing powers of the earth. It offers a home and an opportunity to the ambitious and the industrious from other lands. Resting upon the broad basis of a people's confidence and a people's support, and managed by the people themselves, the government of the United States will meet the problems of the future as satisfactorily as it has solved those of the past.

The Republican party is now, as always, a party of advanced and constructive statesmanship. It is prepared to go forward with the solution of those new questions which social, economic and political development have brought into the forefront of the nation's interest. It will strive, not only in the nation but in the several states, to enact the necessary legislation to safeguard the public health; to limit effectively the labor of women and children; to protect wage earners engaged in dangerous occupations; to enact comprehensive and generous workman's compensation laws in place of the present wasteful and unjust system of employers' liability, and in all possible ways to satisfy the just demand of the

people for the study and solution of the complex and constantly changing problems of social welfare.

In dealing with these questions it is important that the rights of every individual to the freest possible development of his own powers and resources and to the control of his own justly acquired property, so far as those are compatible with the rights of others, shall not be interfered with or destroyed. The social and political structure of the United States rests upon the civil liberty of the individual; and for the protection of the liberty that people have wisely, in the national and state constitutions, put definite limitations upon themselves and upon their governmental officers and agencies. To enforce these limitations, to secure the orderly and coherent exercise of governmental powers and to protect the rights of even the humblest and least favored individual, are the function of independent courts of justice.

The Republican party reaffirms its intention to uphold at all times the authority and integrity of the courts, both state and federal, and it will ever insist that their powers to enforce their process and to protect life, liberty and property shall be preserved inviolate. An orderly method is provided under our system of government by which the people may, when they choose, alter or amend the constitutional provisions which underlie that government. Until these constitutional provisions are so altered or amended, in orderly fashion, it is the duty of the courts to see to it that when challenged they are enforced.

That the courts, both federal and state, may bear the heavy burden laid upon them to the complete satisfaction of public opinion, we favor legislation to prevent long delays and the tedious and costly appeals which have so often amounted to a denial of justice in civil cases and to a failure to protect the public at large in criminal cases.

Since the responsibility of the judiciary is so great, the standards of judicial action must be always and everywhere above suspicion and reproach. While we regard the recall of judges as unnecessary and unwise, we favor such action as may be necessary to simplify the process by which any judge who is found to be derelict in his duty may be removed from office.

Together with peaceful and orderly development at home, the Republican party earnestly favors all measures for the establishment and protection of the peace of the world and for the development of closer relations between the various nations of the earth. It believes most earnestly in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and in the reference of all justiciable controversies between nations to an international court of justice.

The Republican party is opposed to special privilege and to mo-

nopoly. It placed upon the statute book the interstate commerce act of 1887 and the important amendments thereto, and the anti-trust act of 1890, and it has consistently and successfully enforced the provisions of these laws. It will take no backward step to permit the re-establishment in any degree of conditions which were intolerable.

Experience makes it plain that the business of the country may be carried on without fear or without disturbance and at the same time without resort to practices which are abhorrent to the common sense of justice. The Republican party favors the enactment of legislation supplementary to the existing anti-trust act which will define as criminal offences those specific acts that uniformly mark attempts to restrain and to monopolize trade, to the end that those who honestly intend to obey the law may have a guide for their action and that those who aim to violate the law may the more surely be punished. The same certainty should be given to the law prohibiting combinations and monopolies that characterize other provisions of commercial law; in other words, that no part of the field of business opportunity may be restricted by monopoly or combination, that business success honorably achieved may not be converted into crime and that the right of every man to acquire commodities, and particularly the necessities of life, in an open market, uninfluenced by the manipulation of trust or combination, may be preserved.

In the enforcement and administration of federal laws governing interstate commerce and enterprises impressed with a public use engaged therein, there is much that may be committed to a federal trade commission, thus placing in the hands of an administrative board many of the functions now necessarily exercised by the courts. This will promote promptness in the administration of the law and avoid delays and technicalities incident to court procedure.

We reaffirm our belief in a protective tariff. The Republican tariff policy has been of the greatest benefit to the country, developing our resources, diversifying our industries and protecting our workmen against competition with cheaper labor abroad, thus establishing for our wage earners the American standard of living. The protective tariff is so woven into the fabric of our industrial and agricultural life that to substitute for it a tariff for revenue only would destroy many industries and throw millions of our people out of employment. The products of the farm and of the mine should receive the same measure of protection as other products of American labor.

We hold that the import duties should be high enough, while yielding a sufficient revenue, to protect adequately American in-

dustries and wages. Some of the existing import duties are too high and should be reduced. Readjustment should be made from time to time to conform to changing conditions and to reduce excessive rates, but without injury to any American industry. To accomplish this correct information is indispensable. This information can best be obtained by an expert commission, as the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent reports of the Tariff Board has demonstrated.

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

We condemn the Democratic tariff bills passed by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress as sectional, as injurious to the public credit and as destructive of business enterprise.

The steadily increasing cost of living has become a matter not only of national but of worldwide concern. The fact that it is not due to the protective tariff system is evidenced by the existence of similar conditions in countries which have a tariff policy different from our own, as well as by the fact that the cost of living has increased while rates of duty have remained stationary or been reduced. The Republican party will support a prompt scientific inquiry into the causes which are operative, both in the United States and elsewhere, to increase the cost of living. When the exact facts are known it will take the necessary steps to remove any abuses that may be found to exist, in order that the cost of the food, clothing and shelter of the people may in no way be unduly or artificially increased.

The Republican party has always stood for a sound currency and for safe banking methods. It is responsible for the resumption of specie payments and for the establishment of the gold standard. It is committed to the progressive development of our banking and currency systems. Our banking arrangements today need further revision to meet the requirements of current conditions. We need measures which will prevent the recurrence of money panics and financial disturbances, and which will promote the prosperity of business and the welfare of labor by producing constant employment. We need better currency facilities

for the movement of crops in the West and South. We need banking arrangements under American auspices for the encouragement and better conduct of our foreign trade. In attaining these ends the independence of individual banks, whether organized under national or state charters, must be carefully protected, and our banking and currency system must be safeguarded from any possibility of domination by sectional, financial or political interests.

It is of great importance to the social and economic welfare of this country that its farmers have facilities for borrowing easily and cheaply the money they need to increase the productivity of their land. It is as important that financial machinery be provided to supply the demand of farmers for credit as it is that the banking and currency systems be reformed in the interest of general business. Therefore we recommend and urge an authoritative investigation of agricultural credit societies and corporations in other countries and the passage of state and federal laws for the establishment and capable supervision of organizations having for their purpose the loaning of funds to farmers.

We reaffirm our adherence to the principle of appointment to public office based on proved fitness, and tenure during good behavior and efficiency. The Republican party stands committed to the maintenance, extension and enforcement of the civil service law, and it favors the passage of legislation empowering the President to extend the competitive service as far as possible; the equitable retirement of disabled and superannuated members of the civil service, in order that a higher order of efficiency may be maintained.

We favor the amendment of the federal employers' liability law so as to extend its provisions to all government employes, as well as to provide a more liberal scale of compensation for injury and death.

We favor such additional legislation as may be necessary more effectually to prohibit corporations from contributing funds, directly or indirectly, to campaigns for the nomination or election of the President, the Vice-President, Senators and Representatives in Congress. We heartily approve the recent act of Congress requiring the fullest publicity in regard to all campaign contributions, whether made in connection with primaries, conventions or elections.

We rejoice in the success of the distinctive Republican policy of the conservation of our natural resources, for their use by the people without waste and without monopoly. We pledge ourselves to a continuance of such a policy. We favor such fair and reasonable rules and regulations as will not discourage or interfere with actual bona fide home-seekers, prospectors and miners in the acquisition of public lands under existing laws.

In the interest of the general public, and particularly of the agricultural or rural communities, we favor legislation looking to the establishment, under proper regulations, of a parcels post, the postal rates to be graduated under a zone system in proportion to the length of carriage.

We approve the action taken by the President and the Congress to secure with Russia, as with other countries, a treaty that will recognize the absolute right of expatriation and that will prevent all discrimination of whatever kind between American citizens, whether native born or aliens, and regardless of race, religion or previous political allegiance. The right of asylum is a precious possession of the people of the United States, and it is to be neither surrendered nor restricted.

We believe in the maintenance of an adequate navy for the national defence, and we condemn the action of the Democratic House of Representatives in refusing to authorize the construction of additional ships.

We believe that one of the country's most urgent needs is a revived merchant marine. There should be American ships, and plenty of them, to make use of the great American interoceanic canal now nearing completion.

The Mississippi River is the nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from thirty-one states and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many million acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The states unaided cannot cope with this giant problem; hence, we believe the federal government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control, so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

We favor the continuance of the policy of the government with regard to the reclamation of arid lands; and for the encouragement of the speedy settlement and improvement of such lands we favor an amendment to the law that will reasonably extend the time within which the cost of any reclamation project may be repaid by the landowners under it.

We favor a liberal and systematic policy for the improvement of our rivers and harbors. Such improvements should be made upon expert information and after a careful comparison of cost and prospective benefits.

We favor a liberal policy toward Alaska to promote the development of the great resources of that district with such safeguards as will prevent waste and monopoly. We favor the opening of the

coal development through a law leasing the lands on such terms as will invite development and provide fuel for the navy and the commerce of the Pacific Ocean, while retaining title in the United States to prevent monopoly.

The Philippine policy of the Republican party has been and is inspired by the belief that our duty toward the Filipino people is a national obligation which should remain entirely free from partisan politics.

We pledge the Republican party to the enactment of appropriate laws to give relief from the constantly growing evil of induced or undesirable immigration, which is inimical to the progress and welfare of the people of the United States.

We favor the speedy enactment of laws to provide that seamen shall not be compelled to endure involuntary servitude and that life and property at sea shall be safeguarded by the ample equipment of vessels with lifesaving appliances and with full complements of skilled, able-bodied seamen to operate them.

The approaching completion of the Panama Canal, the establishment of a bureau of mines, the institution of postal savings banks, the increased provision made in 1912 for the aged and infirm soldiers and sailors of the Republic and for their widows, and the vigorous administration of laws relating to pure food and drugs, all mark the successful progress of Republican administration and are additional evidences of its effectiveness.

We commend the earnest effort of the Republican administration to secure greater economy and increased efficiency in the conduct of government business; extravagant appropriations and the creation of unnecessary offices are an injustice to the taxpayer and a bad example to the citizen.

We call upon the people to quicken their interest in public affairs, to condemn and punish lynchings and other forms of lawlessness and to strengthen in all possible ways a respect for law and the observance of it. Indifferent citizenship is an evil from which the law affords no adequate protection and for which legislation can provide no remedy.

We congratulate the people of Arizona and New Mexico upon the admission of those states, thus merging in the Union in final and enduring form the last remaining portion of our continental territory.

We ratify in all its particulars the platform of 1908 respecting citizenship for the people of Porto Rico.

We challenge successful criticism of the sixteen years of Republican administration under Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft. We heartily reaffirm the indorsement of President McKinley contained in the platforms of 1900 and 1904, and that of Pres-

ident Roosevelt contained in the platforms of 1904 and 1908. We invite the intelligent judgment of the American people upon the administration of William H. Taft. The country has prospered and been at peace under his Presidency.

During the years in which he had the co-operation of a Republican Congress an unexampled amount of constructive legislation was framed and passed in the interest of the people and in obedience to their wish. That legislation is a record on which any administration might appeal with confidence to the favorable judgment of history.

We appeal to the American electorate upon the record of the Republican party, and upon this declaration of its principles and purposes. We are confident that under the leadership of the candidates here to be nominated our appeal will not be in vain; that the Republican party will meet every just expectation of the people, whose servant it is; that under its administration and its laws our nation will continue to advance; that peace and prosperity will abide with the people, and that new glory will be added to the great Republic.

Two members of the Committee on Resolutions presented a substitute for the platform reported, representing the views of Senator La Follette. The substitute was rejected and the platform was adopted by a vote of 666 to 53; not voting, 343; absent, 21. The majority vote was the largest on any division during the whole session of the convention; it was 108 larger than the vote for Root as temporary chairman; and it will be remembered that the temporary and permanent rolls were identical.

Nominating speeches now being in order, the names of William H. Taft and Robert M. La Follette were presented in the usual way. Mr. Roosevelt's name was not formally presented. The roll-call resulted as follows:—

Whole number of delegates ¹	1078
Necessary for a choice	540
William H. Taft, of Ohio, had	651
Theodore Roosevelt, of New York, had	107
Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, had	41
Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, had	17
Charles E. Hughes, of New York, had	2
Present and not voting	344
Absent	6

¹ There are errors in the official report of the vote both for President and Vice-President. In both tables the total is given as 1550, whereas the whole convention numbered only 1078. The other errors are in addition, the numbers by States are correct.

The name of Vice-President Sherman only was presented for the second place on the ticket. The roll-call resulted as follows : —

Whole number of delegates	1078
Necessary for a choice	540
James S. Sherman, of New York, had	596
William E. Borah, of Idaho, had	21
Charles E. Merriam, of Illinois, had	20
Herbert S. Hadley, of Missouri, had	14
Albert S. Beveridge, of Indiana, had	2
Howard F. Gillette, of Illinois, had	1
Present and not voting	352
Absent	72

Even before the convention adjourned finally, an hour before midnight on June 22, the Roosevelt delegates and some of the contestants who had been refused seats in the convention assembled in a hall near by and offered a nomination to Mr. Roosevelt, who accepted it on certain conditions. The chief stipulation was that a new party should be formed. Arrangements were accordingly at once begun for the organization of such a party, and for the holding of a convention in Chicago in August.

There was an earnest and interesting contest for the Democratic nomination also, but totally different from that in the Republican party. Every Democrat was confident of his party's success in the coming election. Although those who had opposed Mr. Bryan at former elections had not become more radical, nor those who had withheld support from Judge Parker more conservative, yet the party was united in the prospect of victory over the hopelessly divided enemy. That situation invited the condition of a numerous candidacy for the nomination. The field was entered by leading statesmen of the party and by the usual group of "favorite sons." As will be seen, when it came to the roll-calls for nomination a "baker's dozen" of persons had votes; but those between whom the choice actually lay, unless a deadlock should require the selection of a "dark horse," were only five in number. Naming them in alphabetical order they were : —

William J. Bryan, already three times the candidate of the party. On this occasion he declared himself not a candidate ;

but his friends and supporters were many, and there was always a possibility that, failing a two-thirds vote for any other, there might be a stampede in his favor.

Champ Clark, Speaker of the House of Representatives and favorite son of Missouri, who had a numerous following, chiefly in the West and Southwest, with scattering support in other regions.

Judson Harmon, Governor of Ohio, a former member of the Cabinet, and understood to be the choice of the most conservative element of the party.

Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, — a distinctively southern candidate, but popular throughout the country.

Woodrow Wilson, Governor of New Jersey, and former President of Princeton University, whose spectacular campaign in New Jersey and subsequent success with the legislature of that State have already been noted.

In addition to these, in the class of favorite sons may be mentioned Thomas R. Marshall, Governor of Indiana; Eugene N. Foss, Governor of Massachusetts; Simeon E. Baldwin, Governor of Connecticut; and four other gentlemen for whom ultimately scattering votes were given. There were also some "booms" held in reserve for emergencies which did not occur.

The contest for the nomination, as it developed, was not so much a matter of personal preference as in the early stages it promised to be, but a struggle between radicalism and mild conservatism. Mr. Bryan was the most conspicuous figure in every part of the proceedings until the nomination was made, and carried his points triumphantly in every important matter. The few defeats he suffered did not count, as they had no influence on the grand result.

The National Committee, on January 12, issued the call for the convention to meet at Baltimore on June 25. The canvass in behalf of the several candidates began at once. That of Governor Wilson attracted the most attention, both because he himself led it by public speeches on the issues of the day, and because of one or two strange incidents which are here merely mentioned, — their importance having been quite transitory, — a letter by Mr. Wilson, written some years before, in which he referred to Mr. Bryan in uncomplimentary terms, and an admission by the governor, in a letter to the editor who was his first and most prominent champion as a candidate for the presi-

dency, that he regarded that editor's advocacy as injurious to his prospects. Mr. Bryan's participation in the preliminary canvass was limited for the most part to a public declaration against both Governor Harmon and Mr. Underwood, as conservative and reactionary. Between Speaker Clark and Governor Wilson he did not express a preference. The National Committee, in the call for the convention, permitted but did not require the choice of delegates by primary elections. Such elections as were held under the permissive clause present nothing worthy of notice. In fact the nature of the entire contest within the party is sufficiently brought to light in the proceedings of the convention.

Immediately after the opening prayer by Cardinal Gibbons, the National Committee presented to the convention as a candidate for temporary chairman Judge Alton B. Parker, of New York. Mr. Bryan at once interposed, and in a speech of some length proposed the name of Senator Kern, of Indiana, whom he praised, and opposed Judge Parker, whom he denounced as backed by Wall Street influence. He asked if such a man should be "forced on the convention to open a progressive campaign with a paralyzing speech that will dishearten every man in it?" Mr. Kern appealed for harmony, and suggested that if Judge Parker would not withdraw his name, Mr. Bryan himself was the man upon whom the opponents of the judge should unite. Mr. Bryan agreed to be the opposition candidate, and after some discussion the convention elected Parker by 579 votes to 508 for Bryan. In a general way the Parker vote was cast by the supporters of Underwood and Harmon; and a large number of Bryan's votes came from those who supported Wilson on the first vote to effect a nomination. Clark's followers were divided. The speech in which Judge Parker opened the proceedings of the convention by no means justified Mr. Bryan's premonitory misgivings. The only further business on the first day of the session was the completion of the temporary organization and the appointment of committees.

No business being ready on the morning of Wednesday, the 26th, the convention listened to general speechmaking for two hours, and then took a recess until the evening, when there was a four hours' struggle over the report of the Committee on Rules, on a question involving the "unit rule." The point arose in connection with the Ohio delegation. The situation was substantially the reverse of the California case in the Re-

publican Convention. The law of Ohio required the election of delegates to national conventions by congressional districts. Most of the districts were for Governor Harmon, but several of them chose men favorable to Clark or Wilson. The State convention, controlled strongly by the supporters of Harmon, instructed the delegation to vote as a unit. The Committee on Rules proposed a rule that all delegations instructed by the State convention to vote as a unit should so vote. A minority of the committee, consisting of nineteen members, offered a modification, providing for the exception where the State law required the choice to be made by districts, and did not put the district delegates under the authority of the State convention. After debate the minority report prevailed by 562½ votes against 492½. Those who spoke in favor of the minority report avowed their adherence to the time-honored unit rule, in principle, and based their yielding in this case upon their reverence for the authority of a "sovereign State."

The report of the Committee on Credentials was taken on the third day. There was an interesting but unimportant contest in the delegation from South Dakota. After that was decided the permanent organization was effected by the choice of Ollie M. James, of Kentucky, as president, and E. E. Britton, of North Carolina, as secretary. The convention then took a recess until evening when Mr. Bryan made a dramatic entry into the proceedings by offering the following resolution: —

Resolved, That in this crisis in our party's career and in our country's history this convention sends greeting to the people of the United States, and assures them that the party of Jefferson and Jackson is still the champion of popular government and equality before the law. As proof of our fidelity to the people we hereby declare ourselves opposed to the nomination of any candidate for President who is the representative of or under obligation to J. Pierpont Morgan, Thomas F. Ryan, August Belmont, or any other of the privilege-hunting and favor-seeking class.

Be it further resolved, That we demand the withdrawal from this convention of any delegate or delegates constituting or representing the above-named interests.

The rules of the convention required the reference of all resolutions to the Committee on the Platform, but Mr. Bryan asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of his resolution. That being refused, he moved that the rules be suspended. An excited debate took place, for both Mr.

Ryan and Mr. Belmont were members of the convention. Several of the speakers having expressed themselves as willing to vote for the first paragraph, but not for the second, Mr. Bryan withdrew that paragraph. Ultimately, under the operation of the previous question the rules were suspended and the resolution was adopted, 883 yeas to 201½ nays.

Nominating speeches being now in order, — for the Committee on Rules had deliberately provided, and the convention had voted, that the nominations should be made before the platform was reported, — the names of Messrs. Underwood, Clark, Baldwin, Wilson, Marshall, and Harmon were presented in that order, an order that was determined solely by the alphabetical position of the States presenting or seconding candidates. A single roll-call for a nomination was taken the same night — or rather morning; for when the announcement was made that there was no choice it was after 7.30 o'clock on Friday morning. The convention then adjourned until afternoon of the same day, when, and on the following days, until the afternoon of Tuesday, the seventh day of the session, forty-five more votes were taken. Woodrow Wilson was nominated on the forty-sixth trial. The following table gives the votes in detail. The convention nominally consisted of 1088 delegates, and two-thirds of that number, 726, were necessary for a choice. Several States sent to the convention twice as many delegates as they were entitled to elect, each with half a vote; and one State, Kentucky, sent a triple delegation, giving to each man a third of a vote. That is the explanation of the fractions below. Fractional votes have usually resulted from contests for seats; the convention, being unable or unwilling to decide against either party, has admitted both, with half a vote each.

During the contest for nomination thirteen persons in all received votes. They were: Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey; Champ Clark, of Missouri; Judson Harmon, of Ohio; Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama; Simeon E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana; Eugene N. Foss, of Massachusetts; William J. Bryan, of Nebraska; William Sulzer, of New York; John W. Kern, of Indiana; William J. Gaynor, of New York; James H. Lewis, of Illinois; and Ollie M. James, of Kentucky. The votes for the six last-named are not included in the table, as the number any one of them received only once exceeded five. On most of the trials Mr. Bryan had one or more votes — usually one; and Mr.

Kern also was favored with a single vote more than half of the time. The votes for the leading and secondary candidates were as follows : —

BALLOTS	Wilson	Clark	Underwood	Harmon	Marshall	Baldwin	Foss
First.....	324	440½	117½	148	31	22	..
Second.....	339¾	446½	111¼	141	31	14	..
Third.....	346	441	114½	140½	31	14	..
Fourth.....	349½	443	112	136½	31	14	..
Fifth.....	351	443	119½	141½	31
Sixth.....	354	445	121	135	31
Seventh.....	352½	449½	123½	129½	31
Eighth.....	351½	448½	123	130	31
Ninth.....	352½	452	122½	127	31
Tenth.....	350½	556	117½	31	31
Eleventh.....	354½	554	118½	29	30
Twelfth.....	364	547½	123	29	30
Thirteenth.....	366	554½	115½	29	30	..	2
Fourteenth.....	361	553	111	29	30
Fifteenth.....	362½	552	110½	29	30
Sixteenth.....	362½	551	112½	29	30
Seventeenth.....	362½	545	112½	29	30
Eighteenth.....	361	535	125	29	30
Nineteenth.....	358	532	130	29	30	..	1
Twentieth.....	388½	512	121½	29	30	..	2
Twenty-first.....	395½	508	118½	29	30	..	5
Twenty-second..	396½	500½	115	..	30	..	43
Twenty-third ..	399	497½	114½	..	30	..	45
Twenty-fourth ..	402½	496	115½	..	30	..	43
Twenty-fifth ..	405	469	108	29	30	..	43
Twenty-sixth....	407½	463½	112½	29	30	..	43
Twenty-seventh ..	406½	469	112	29	30	..	38
Twenty-eighth..	437½	468½	112½	29	38
Twenty-ninth...	436	468½	112	29	38
Thirtieth.....	460	455	121½	19	30
Thirty-first.....	475½	446½	116½	17	30
Thirty-second...	477½	446½	113½	14	28
Thirty-third	477½	447½	103½	29	28
Thirty-fourth....	479½	447½	101½	29	28
Thirty-fifth.	494½	433½	101½	29	28
Thirty-sixth	496½	434½	98½	29	28
Thirty-seventh..	496½	432½	100½	29	28
Thirty-eighth...	498½	425	106	29	28
Thirty-ninth.....	501½	422	106	29	28
Fortieth.....	501½	423	106	28	28
Forty-first	490½	424	106	27	28
Forty-second....	494	430	104	27	28
Forty-third.....	602	329	98½	28	27
Forty-fourth.....	629	306	99	27	27
Forty-fifth.....	633	306	97	25	27
Forty-sixth.....	990	84	..	12

The nomination was made unanimous on the motion of Senator Stone, of Missouri, Mr. Clark's manager. The result was not reached without a sensational incident in which Mr. Bryan was again the most conspicuous figure. The ninety votes of New York, which were at first given to Harmon,

were transferred on the tenth roll-call to Clark. That change to the candidate whom Mr. Bryan was himself supporting led him to interpose, after the thirteenth trial, to explain his vote. The point which he made was that the change of its vote by New York was the work of Tammany, or rather of the leader of that organization; that if it were effectual in leading to the nomination of Clark it would put the nominee under obligation to that leader and to the three men named in his condemnatory resolution; and that it indicated the opinion of the man whom he believed to be in control of the delegation that Clark was more conservative and less progressive than Wilson. Accordingly he announced that so long as the vote of New York was given to Clark, he, who was under instructions to support Clark, would withhold his vote from that candidate and vote for Wilson.

On the roll-call that followed his intervention no other Nebraska delegate imitated Mr. Bryan's example; and, as will be seen from the table, Mr. Clark lost only one half-vote besides that of Bryan. But the decline in the Clark vote began at that point and continued to the end. On the twenty-seventh roll-call a prominent New York member made a vigorous defence of the honor of the delegation, and repudiated with indignation Mr. Bryan's outspoken accusation that the members were influenced and controlled by the Tammany leader. On a poll of the delegation Clark had 78 votes; Wilson, 9; Underwood, 2; not voting, 1. But under the unit rule which governed New York, its ninety votes were still cast for Clark.

The Committee on Resolutions interrupted the nominating speeches for Vice-President, in the evening, by reporting the following platform, which was unanimously adopted without discussion:—

We, the representatives of the Democratic party of the United States, in national convention assembled, reaffirm our devotion to the principles of Democratic government formulated by Thomas Jefferson and enforced by a long and illustrious line of Democratic Presidents.

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the federal government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties, except for the purpose of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of government honestly and economically administered.

The high Republican tariff is the principal cause of the unequal distribution of wealth; it is a system of taxation which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer; under its operations the American farmer and laboring man are the chief sufferers; it raises the cost of the necessities of life to them but does not protect their product or wages. The farmer sells largely in free markets and buys almost entirely in the protected markets. In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries. We denounce the Republican pretence on that subject and assert that American wages are established by competitive conditions and not by the tariff.

We favor the immediate downward revision of the existing high and in many cases prohibitive tariff duties, insisting that material reductions be speedily made upon the necessities of life. Articles entering into competition with trust controlled products and articles of American manufacture which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home should be put upon the free list.

We recognize that our system of tariff taxation is intimately connected with the business of the country and we favor the ultimate attainment of the principles we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry.

We denounce the action of President Taft in vetoing the bills to reduce the tariff in the cotton, woolen, metals and chemical schedules and the farmers' free list bill, all of which were designed to give immediate relief to the masses from the exactions of the trusts.

The Republican party, while promising tariff revision, has shown by its tariff legislation that such revision is not to be in the people's interest and, having been faithless to its pledges of 1908, it should not longer enjoy the confidence of the nation. We appeal to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only.

The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home. The Republican party, in its platform, attempts to escape from responsibility for present conditions by denying that they are due to a protective tariff. We take issue with them on this subject and charge that excessive prices result in a large measure from the high tariff laws enacted and maintained by the Republican party and from trusts and commercial conspiracies fostered and encouraged by such laws, and we assert that no substantial relief can be secured for the people until import duties on the necessities of life are materially reduced and these criminal conspiracies broken up.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. We, there-

fore, favor the vigorous enforcement of the criminal as well as the civil law against trusts and trust officials, and demand the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States.

We favor the declaration by law of the conditions upon which corporations shall be permitted to engage in interstate trade, including among others, the prevention of holding companies, of interlocking directors, of stock watering, of discrimination in price, and the control by any one corporation of so large a proportion of any industry as to make it a menace to competitive conditions.

We condemn the action of the Republican administration in compromising with the Standard Oil Company and the Tobacco Trust and its failure to invoke the criminal provisions of the anti-trust law against the officers of those corporations after the court had declared that from the undisputed facts in the record they had violated the criminal provisions of the law.

We regret that the Sherman anti-trust law has received a judicial construction depriving it of much of its efficacy and we favor the enactment of legislation which will restore to the statute the strength of which it has been deprived by such interpretation.

We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the federal government — the executive, the legislative and the judicial — each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

Believing that the most efficient results under our system of government are to be attained by the full exercise by the states of their reserved sovereign powers, we denounce as usurpation the efforts of our opponents to deprive the states of any of the rights reserved to them, and to enlarge and magnify by indirection the powers of the federal government.

We insist upon the full exercise of all the powers of the government, both state and national, to protect the people from injustice at the hands of those who seek to make the government a private asset in business. There is no twilight zone between the nation and the state in which exploiting interests can take refuge from both. It is as necessary that the federal government shall exercise the powers reserved to them, but we insist that federal remedies for the regulation of interstate commerce and for the prevention of private monopoly shall be added to and not substituted for state remedies.

We congratulate the country upon the triumph of two important reforms demanded in the last national platform, namely, the amendment of the federal Constitution authorizing an income tax and the amendment providing for the popular election of Senators,

and we call upon the people of all the states to rally to the support of the pending propositions and secure their ratification.

We note with gratification the unanimous sentiment in favor of publicity before the election of campaign contributions — a measure demanded in our national platform of 1908, and at that time opposed by the Republican party — and we commend the Democratic House of Representatives for extending the doctrine of publicity to recommendations, verbal and written, upon which Presidential appointments are made, to the ownership and control of newspapers and to the expenditures made by and in behalf of those who aspire to Presidential nominations, and we point for additional justification for this legislation to the enormous expenditures of money in behalf of the President and his predecessor in the recent contest for the Republican nomination for President.

The movement toward more popular government should be promoted through legislation in each state which will permit the expression of the preference of the electors for national candidates at Presidential primaries.

We direct that the national committee incorporate in the call for the next nominating convention a requirement that all expressions of preference for Presidential candidates shall be given and the selection of delegates and alternates made through a primary election conducted by the party organization in each state where such expression and election are not provided for by state law. Committeemen who are hereafter to constitute the membership of the Democratic National Committee, and whose election is not provided for by law, shall be chosen in each state at such primary elections, and the service and authority of committeemen, however chosen, shall begin immediately upon the receipt of their credentials, respectively.

We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund and any individual from contributing any amount above a reasonable maximum.

We favor a single Presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

At this time, when the Republican party, after a generation of unlimited power in its control of the federal government, is rent into factions, it is opportune to point to the record of accomplishment of the Democratic House of Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress. We indorse its action and we challenge comparison of its record with that of any Congress which has been controlled by our opponents.

We call the attention of the patriotic citizens of our country to its record of efficiency, economy and constructive legislation.

It has, among other achievements, revised the rules of the House of Representatives so as to give to the Representatives of the American people freedom of speech and of action in advocating, proposing and perfecting remedial legislation.

It has passed bills for the relief of the people and the development of our country; it has endeavored to revise the tariff taxes downward in the interest of the consuming masses and thus to reduce the high cost of living.

It has proposed an amendment to the federal Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people.

It has secured the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as two sovereign states.

It has required the publicity of campaign expenses, both before and after election, and fixed a limit upon the election expenses of United States Senators and Representatives.

It has also passed a bill to prevent the abuse of the writ of injunction.

It has passed a law establishing an eight-hour day for workmen on all national public work.

It has passed a resolution which forced the President to take immediate steps to abrogate the Russian treaty.

And it has passed the great supply bills which lessen waste and extravagance and which reduce the annual expenses of the government by many millions of dollars.

We approve of the measure reported by the Democratic leaders in the House of Representatives for the creation of a council of national defence which will determine a definite naval programme with a view to increased efficiency and economy.

The party that proclaimed and has always enforced the Monroe Doctrine and was sponsor for the new navy will continue faithfully to observe the constitutional requirements to provide and maintain an adequate and well proportioned navy, sufficient to defend American policies, protect our citizens and uphold the honor and dignity of the nation.

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a Democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

We favor the efficient supervision and rate regulation of rail-

roads, express companies, telegraph and telephone lines engaged in interstate commerce. To this end we recommend the valuation of railroads, express companies, telegraph and telephone lines by the Interstate Commerce Commission, such valuation to take into consideration the physical value of the property, the original cost, the cost of reproduction and any element of value that will render the valuation fair and just.

We favor such legislation as will effectually prohibit the railroads, express, telegraph and telephone companies from engaging in business which brings them into competition with their shippers or patrons; also legislation preventing the overissue of stocks and bonds by interstate railroads, express companies, telegraph and telephone lines, and legislation which will assure such reduction in transportation rates as conditions will permit, care being taken to avoid reduction that would compel a reduction of wages, prevent adequate service or do injustice to legitimate investments.

We oppose the so-called Aldrich bill or the establishment of a central bank, and we believe the people of the country will be largely freed from panics and consequent unemployment and business depression by such a systematic revision of our banking laws as will render temporary relief in localities where such relief is needed, with protection from control or domination by what is known as the "money trust."

Banks exist for the accommodation of the public, and not for the control of business. All legislation on the subject of banking and currency should have for its purpose the securing of these accommodations on terms of absolute security to the public and of complete protection from the misuse of the power that wealth gives to those who possess it.

We condemn the present methods of depositing government funds in a few favored banks, largely situated in or controlled by Wall Street, in return for political favors, and we pledge our party to provide by law for their deposit by competitive bidding in the banking institutions of the country, national and state, without discrimination as to locality, upon approved securities and subject to call by the government.

Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits or agricultural finance. Therefore, we recommend that an investigation of agricultural credit societies in foreign countries be made, so that it may be ascertained whether a system of rural credits may be devised suitable to conditions in the United States; and we also favor legislation permitting national banks to loan a reasonable proportion of their funds on real estate security.

We recognize the value of vocational education and urge fed-

eral appropriations for such training and extension teaching in agriculture in co-operation with the several states.

We renew the declaration in our last platform relating to the conservation of our natural resources and the development of our waterways. The present devastation of the Lower Mississippi Valley accentuates the movement for the regulation of river flow by additional bank and levee protection below, the division, storage and control of the flood waters above, their utilization for beneficial purposes in the reclamation of arid and swamp lands and the development of water power, instead of permitting the floods to continue as heretofore, agents of destruction.

We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel and the prevention of the overflow of the land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service and the enormous loss of life and property impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the general government.

To maintain an adequate depth of water the entire year and thereby encourage water transportation is a consummation worthy of legislative attention and presents an issue national in its character. It calls for prompt action on the part of Congress, and the Democratic party pledges itself to the enactment of legislation leading to that end.

We favor the coöperation of the United States and the respective states in plans for the comprehensive treatment of all waterways with a view of coördinating plans for channel improvement, with plans for drainage of swamp and overflowed lands, and to this end we favor the appropriation by the federal government of sufficient funds to make surveys of such lands, to develop plans for draining of the same and to supervise the work of construction.

We favor the adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for the development and improvement of our inland waterways, with economy and efficiency, so as to permit their navigation by vessels of standard draft.

We favor national aid to state and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

We repeat our declarations of the platform of 1908, as follows:—

“The courts of justice are the bulwarks of our liberties, and we yield to none in our purpose to maintain their dignity. Our party has given to the bench a long line of distinguished justices who have added to the respect and confidence in which this department must be jealously maintained. We resent the attempt of the Republican party to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is

an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for the courts.

"It is the function of the courts to interpret the laws which the people enact, and if the laws appear to work economic, social or political injustice it is our duty to change them. The only basis upon which the integrity of our courts can stand is that of unswerving justice and protection of life, personal liberty and property. As judicial processes may be abused, we should guard them against abuse.

"Experience has proved the necessity of a modification of the present law relating to injunction, and we reiterate the pledges of our platforms of 1896 and 1904 in favor of a measure which passed the United States Senate in 1886, relating to contempt in federal courts and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

"Questions of judicial practice have arisen, especially in connection with industrial disputes. We believe that the parties to all judicial proceedings should be treated with rigid impartiality, and that injunctions should not be issued in any case in which an injunction would not issue if no industrial dispute were involved.

"The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of the wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions, to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

"We pledge the Democratic party to the enactment of a law creating a department of labor represented separately in the President's Cabinet, in which department shall be included the subject of mines and mining."

We pledge the Democratic party, so far as the federal jurisdiction extends, to an employé's compensation law providing adequate indemnity for injury to body or loss of life.

We believe in the conservation and the development, for the use of all the people, of the natural resources of the country. Our forests, our sources of water supply, our arable and our mineral lands, our navigable streams, and all the other material resources with which our country has been so lavishly endowed, constitute the foundation of our national wealth. Such additional legislation as may be necessary to prevent their being wasted or absorbed by special or privileged interests should be enacted and the policy of their conservation should be rigidly adhered to.

The public domain should be administered and disposed of with due regard to the general welfare. Reservations should be limited to the purposes which they purport to serve and not extended to

include land wholly unsuited therefor. The unnecessary withdrawal from sale and settlement of enormous tracts of public land, upon which tree growth never existed and cannot be promoted, tends only to retard development, create discontent and bring reproach upon the policy of conservation.

The public land laws should be administered in a spirit of the broadest liberality toward the settler exhibiting a *bona fide* purpose to comply therewith, to the end that the invitation of this government to the landless should be as attractive as possible, and the plain provisions of the forest reserve act permitting homestead entries to be made within the national forests should not be nullified by administrative regulations which amount to a withdrawal of great areas of the same from settlement.

Immediate action should be taken by Congress to make available the vast and valuable coal deposits of Alaska under conditions that will be a perfect guarantee against their falling into the hands of monopolizing corporations, associations or interests.

We rejoice in the inheritance of mineral resources unequalled in extent, variety or value, and in the development of a mining industry unequalled in its magnitude and importance. We honor the men who, in their hazardous toil underground, daily risk their lives in extracting and preparing for our use the products of the mine, so essential to the industries, the commerce and the comfort of the people of this country. And we pledge ourselves to the extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines in every way appropriate for national legislation, with a view to safeguarding the lives of the miners, lessening the waste of essential resources and promoting the economic development of mining, which, along with agriculture, must in the future, even more than in the past, serve as the very foundation of our national prosperity and welfare and our international commerce.

We believe in encouraging the development of a modern system of agriculture and a systematic effort to improve the conditions of trade in farm products so as to benefit both the consumers and producers. And as an efficient means to this end we favor the enactment by Congress of legislation that will suppress the pernicious practice of gambling in agricultural products by organized exchanges or others.

We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the public treasury. We urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of laws for the greater security of life and property at sea; and we favor the re-

peal of all laws and the abrogation of so much of our treaties with other nations as provide for the arrest and imprisonment of seamen charged with desertion or with violation of their contract of service.

Such laws and treaties are un-American and violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution of the United States.

We favor the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal.

We also favor legislation forbidding the use of the Panama Canal by ships owned or controlled by railroad carriers engaged in transportation competitive with the canal.

We reaffirm our previous declarations advocating the union and strengthening of the various governmental agencies relating to pure foods, quarantine, vital statistics and human health. Thus united and administered without partiality to or discrimination against any school of medicine or system of healing, they would constitute a single health service, not subordinated to any commercial or financial interests, but devoted exclusively to the conservation of human life and efficiency. Moreover, this health service should cooperate with the health agencies of our various states and cities, without interference with their prerogatives or with the freedom of individuals to employ such medical or hygienic aid as they may see fit.

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rigidly enforced, to the end that merit and ability should be the standard of appointment, and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party; and we favor a reorganization of the civil service with adequate compensation commensurate with the class of work performed for all officers and employes. We also favor the extension to all classes of civil service employes of the benefits of the provisions of the employers' liability law. We also recognize the right of direct petition to Congress by employes for the redress of grievances.

We recognize the urgent need of reform in the administration of civil and criminal law in the United States, and we recommend the enactment of such legislation and the promotion of such measures as will rid the present legal system of the delays, expense and uncertainties incident to the system as now administered.

We reaffirm the position thrice announced by the Democracy in national convention assembled against a policy of imperialism and colonial exploitation in the Philippines and elsewhere. We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder, which has involved us in enormous expense, brought us weakness instead of strength and laid our nation open to the charge of abandonment of the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We

favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other Powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

We welcome Arizona and New Mexico to the sisterhood of states, and heartily congratulate them upon their auspicious beginnings of great and glorious careers.

We demand for the people of Alaska the full enjoyment of the rights and privileges of a territorial form of government, and we believe that the officials appointed to administer the government of all our territories and the District of Columbia should be qualified by previous *bona fide* residence.

We commend the patriotism of the Democratic members of the Senate and House of Representatives which compelled the termination of the Russian treaty of 1832, and we pledge ourselves anew to preserve the sacred rights of American citizenship at home and abroad. No treaty should receive the sanction of our government which does not recognize the equality of all of our citizens, irrespective of race or creed, and which does not expressly guarantee the fundamental right of expatriation.

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States government, both for himself and his property.

We favor the establishment of a parcels post or postal express, and also the extension of the rural delivery system as rapidly as practicable.

We hereby express our deep interest in the great Panama Canal Exposition to be held in San Francisco in 1915, and favor such encouragement as can be properly given.

We commend to the several states the adoption of a law making it an offence for the proprietors of places of public amusement and entertainment to discriminate against the uniform of the United States similar to the law passed by Congress applicable to the District of Columbia and the territories in 1911.

We renew the declaration of our last platform relating to a generous pension policy.

We call attention to the fact that the Democratic party's demand for a return to the rule of the people, expressed in the national platform four years ago, has now become the accepted doctrine of a large majority of the electors. We again remind the

country that only by a larger exercise of the reserved power of the people can they protect themselves from the misuse of delegated power and the usurpation of governmental instrumentalities by special interests. For this reason, the national convention insisted on the overthrow of Cannonism and the inauguration of a system by which United States Senators could be elected by direct vote. The Democratic party offers itself to the country as an agency through which the complete overthrow and extirpation of corruption, fraud and machine rule in American politics can be effected.

Our platform is one of principles which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the coöperation of all citizens, regardless of party, who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

Two roll-calls for the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President resulted in no choice, as follows:—

	<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>
Whole number of the convention . .	1088	
Two-thirds, necessary to a choice . .	726	
Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana	389	644 $\frac{1}{2}$
John Burke, of North Dakota	304 $\frac{2}{3}$	386 $\frac{1}{3}$
George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon . . .	157	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Elmore W. Hurst, of Illinois	78	—
James W. Preston, of Maryland	58	—
M. J. Wade, of Iowa	26	—
William F. McCombs, of New York . . .	18	—
John E. Osborne, of Wyoming	8	—
William Sulzer, of New York	3	—
Not voting	46 $\frac{1}{3}$	44 $\frac{2}{3}$

After the second vote the name of Governor Burke was withdrawn, and Governor Marshall, of Indiana, was unanimously nominated by acclamation.

Before the convention adjourned a resolution was adopted which does away in the future with the practice of duplicating or triplicating a delegation, with a fraction of a vote for each person. The new rule provides for two delegates, with one vote each, for each senator or representative in Congress to which a State is entitled. The convention was in session seven days—seventy-four hours in all.

The first party to make nominations for President and Vice-President in the canvass of 1912 was the Socialist Labor party, which held its convention in Arlington Hall, New York City, on April 7 (Sunday) and the following days. The number of delegates reported was "about forty," representing eighteen States, but only twenty-seven votes were recorded on the nominations. The convention was presided over by a different chairman each day. The following platform was adopted: —

The Socialist Labor Party of the United States of America in National Convention assembled in New York on April 10th, 1912, re-affirming its previous platform pronouncements, and in accord with the International Socialist Movement, declares: —

Social conditions, as illustrated by the events that crowded into the last four years, have ripened so fast that each and all the principles, hitherto proclaimed by the Socialist Labor Party, and all and each of the methods that the Socialist Labor Party has hitherto advocated, stand to-day most conspicuously demonstrated.

The Capitalist Social System has wrought its own destruction. Its leading exponents, the present incumbent in the presidential chair, and his "illustrious predecessor," however seemingly at war with each other on principles, cannot conceal the identity of their political views. The oligarchy proclaimed by the tenets of the one, the monarchy proclaimed by the tenets of the other, jointly proclaim the conviction of the foremost men of the Ruling Class that the Republic of Capital is at the end of its tether.

True to the economic laws from which Socialism proceeds, dominant wealth has to such an extent concentrated into the hands of a select few, the Plutocracy, that the lower layers of the Capitalist Class feel driven to the ragged edge, while the large majority of the people, the Working Class, are being submerged.

True to the sociologic laws, by the light of which Socialism reads its forecasts, the Plutocracy is breaking through its republic-democratic shell and is stretching out its hands towards Absolutism in government; the property-holding layers below it are turning at bay; the proletariat is awakening to its consciousness of class, and thereby to the perception of its historic mission.

In the midst of this hurly, all the colors of the rainbow are being projected upon the social mists from the prevalent confusion of thought.

From the lower layers of the Capitalist Class the bolder, yet foolhardy, portion bluntly demands that "the Trust be smashed."

Even if the Trust could, it should not be smashed; even if it should, it cannot. The law of social progress pushes toward a sys-

tem of production that shall crown the efforts of man, without arduous toil, with an abundance of the necessities for material existence, to the end of allowing leisure for mental and spiritual expansion. The Trust is a mechanical contrivance wherewith to solve the problem. To smash the contrivance were to re-introduce the days of small-fry competition, and set back the hands of the dial of time. The mere thought is foolhardy. He who undertakes the feat might as well brace himself against the cascade of Niagara. The cascade of Social Evolution would overwhelm him.

The less bold among the smaller property-holding element proposes to "curb" the Trust with a variety of schemes. The very forces of social evolution that propel the development of the Trust stamp the "curbing" schemes, whether political or economic, as childish. They are attempts to hold back a runaway horse by the tail. The laws by which the attempt has been tried strew the path of the runaway. They are splintered to pieces with its kicks, and serve only to furnish a livelihood for the Corporation and the Anti-Corporation lawyer.

From still lower layers of the same property-holding class, social layers that have sniffed the breath of Socialism and imagine themselves Socialists, comes the iridescent theory of capturing the Trust for the people by the ballot only. The "capture of the Trust for the people" implies the Social Revolution. To imply the Social Revolution with the ballot only, without the means to enforce the ballot's fiat, in case of Reaction's attempt to override it, is to fire blank cartridges at a foe. It is worse. It is to threaten his existence without the means to carry out the threat. Threats of revolution, without provisions to carry them out, result in one of two things only — either the leaders are bought out, or the revolutionary class, to which the leaders appeal and which they succeed in drawing after themselves, are led like cattle to the shambles. The Commune disaster of France stands a monumental warning against the blunder.

An equally iridescent hue of the rainbow is projected from a still lower layer, a layer that lies almost wholly within the submerged class — the theory of capturing the Trust for the Working Class with the fist only. The capture of the Trust for the people implies something else besides revolution. It implies revolution carried on by the masses. For reasons parallel to those that decree the day of small-fry competition gone by, mass-revolutionary conspiracy is, to-day, an impossibility. The Trust-holding Plutocracy may successfully put through a conspiracy of physical force. The smallness of its numbers makes a successful conspiracy possible on its part. The hugeness of the numbers requisite for a revolution against the Trust-holding Plutocracy excludes Conspiracy

from the arsenal of the Revolution. The idea of capturing the Trust with physical force only is a wild chimera.

Only two programs — the program of the Plutocracy and the programme of the Socialist Labor Party — grasp the situation.

The Political State, another name for the Class State, is worn out in this, the leading capitalist nation of the world, most prominently. The Industrial or Socialist State is throbbing for birth. The Political State, being a Class State, is government separate and apart from the productive energies of the people; it is government mainly for holding the ruled class in subjection. The Industrial or Socialist State, being the denial of the Class State, is government that is part and parcel of the productive energies of the people.

As their functions are different, so are the structures of the two States different.

The structure of the Political State contemplates territorial "representation" only; the structure of the Industrial State contemplates representation of industries, of useful occupations only.

The economic or industrial evolution has reached that point where the Political State no longer can maintain itself under the forms of democracy. While the Plutocracy has relatively shrunk, the enemies it has raised against itself have become too numerous to be dallied with. What is still worse, obedient to the law of its own existence the Political State has been forced not merely to multiply enemies against itself; it has been forced to recruit and group the bulk of these enemies, the revolutionary bulk, at that.

The Working Class of the land, the historically revolutionary element, is grouped by the leading occupations, agricultural as well as industrial, in such manner that the "autonomous craft union" one time the palladium of the workers, has become a harmless scarecrow upon which the capitalist birds roost at ease, while the Industrial Unions cast ahead of them the constituencies of the government of the future, and, jointly, point to the Industrial State.

Nor yet is this all. Not only has the Political State raised its own enemies; not only has itself multiplied them; not only has itself recruited and drilled them; not only has itself grouped them into shape and form to succeed it; it is, furthermore, driven by its inherent necessities, prodding on the Revolutionary Class by digging ever more fiercely into its flanks the harpoon of exploitation.

With the purchasing power of wages sinking to ever lower depths; with certainty of work hanging on ever slenderer threads; with an ever more gigantically swelling army of the unemployed; with the need of profits pressing the Plutocracy harder and harder

recklessly to squander the workers' limbs and life; what with all this and the parallel process of merging the workers of all industries into one interdependent solid mass, the final break-up is rendered inevitable and at hand.

No wild schemes and no rainbow-chasing will stead in the approaching emergency. The Plutocracy knows this — and so does the Socialist Labor Party — and logical is the programme of each.

The programme of the Plutocracy is feudal Autocracy, translated into Capitalism. Where a Social Revolution is pending, and, for whatever reason, is not enforced, reaction is the alternative.

The programme of the Socialist Labor Party is revolution — the Industrial or Socialist Republic, the Social Order where the Political State is overthrown; where the Congress of the land consists of the representatives of the useful occupations of the land; where, accordingly, a government is an essential factor in production; where the blessings to a man that the Trust is instinct with are freed from the trammels of the private ownership that now turn the potential blessings into a curse; where, accordingly, abundance can be the patrimony of all who work; and the shackles of wage slavery are no more.

In keeping with the goals of the different programmes are the means of their execution.

The means in contemplation by reaction is the bayonet. To this end reaction is seeking, by means of the police spy and other agencies, to lash the proletariat into acts of violence that may give a color to the resort to the bayonet. By its manoeuvres, it is egging the Working Class on to deeds of fury. The capitalist press echoes the policy, while the pure and simple political Socialist Party press, generally, is snared into the trap.

On the contrary, the means firmly adhered to by the Socialist Labor Party is the constitutional method of political action, backed by the industrially and class-consciously organized proletariat, to the exclusion of Anarchy, and all that thereby hangs.

At such a critical period in the Nation's existence the Socialist Labor Party calls upon the Working Class of America, more deliberately serious than ever before, to rally at the polls under the Party's banner. And the Party also calls upon all intelligent citizens to place themselves squarely upon the ground of Working Class interests, and join us in this mighty and noble work of human emancipation, so that we may put summary end to the existing barbarous class conflict by placing the land and all the means of production, transportation and distribution into the hands of the people as a collective body, and substituting for the present state of planless production, industrial war, and social disorder, the

Social or Industrial Commonwealth — a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the modern factors of civilization.

Arthur E. Reimer, of Massachusetts, was nominated for President, receiving 26 votes, to 1 for John M. Francis. The official organ of the party reports that the nomination was received with "thunderous applause." For Vice-President, August Gilhaus, of New York, had 21 votes to 6 for Mr. Francis.

The convention of the Socialist party was held at Indianapolis, May 12 to 18. As usual it began on Sunday, and was conducted on the *unconventional* system already described — everything discussed, every proposition open to amendment, the proceedings as informal as those of a school debating club, committees elected by free ballot, a new chairman every day, and so on.

Every State except Tennessee was represented, some of them by a single delegate only, other States in varying numbers up to 18 for California, 23 for New York, and 24 for Pennsylvania. The rule of apportionment is that the representation is based upon the comparative amount of dues paid by the States to the national organization. The whole number of delegates was 294, of whom 18, at least, were women, and the women took their full share in the debates. A Socialist convention has many other functions than the draft of a platform and the nomination of candidates — the only functions that now concern us. It is a general governing body of all the State and local Socialist units that make the whole. Rather, it is the body that prepares and submits to all the Socialists in the country propositions which become effective only when ratified by a majority of those voting. Thus, a new constitution that was agreed upon at the May convention was submitted to a general referendum, and approved in August, 1912.

Twenty-three members were nominated for membership of the Committee on the Platform, and the nine who were elected had votes varying between 219 and 118. The committee made its report on Thursday, the 16th, and the long evening session of that day was devoted to a consideration of it, paragraph by paragraph. Some significance that does not belong to it might be attached to the vote, 117 ayes to 94 nays, to strike out a clause urging "the gradual reduction of all tariff duties." The

result was not — at any rate not precisely — an indication of the tariff views of the delegates. The rejection of the clause was advocated on the ground that the tariff is not a Socialist issue at all. Several delegates spoke of the controversy between the Republicans and the Democrats in the most sarcastic terms. One lady delegate spurned “free trade, the open door, protection, reciprocity, and all the other fool things the old parties have been giving us.” She had, she declared, been as poor under free trade as she then was under a protective tariff. “For goodness’ sake, don’t split on the tariff question.”

After full discussion the platform as a whole was adopted, as follows : —

The representatives of the Socialist party in national convention at Indianapolis, declare that the capitalist system has outgrown its historical function, and has become utterly incapable of meeting the problems now confronting society. We denounce this outgrown system as incompetent and corrupt and the source of unspeakable misery and suffering to the whole working class.

Under this system the industrial equipment of the Nation has passed into the absolute control of a plutocracy which exacts an annual tribute of millions of dollars from the producers. Unafraid of any organized resistance, it stretches out its greedy hands over the still undeveloped resources of the Nation — the land, the mines, the forests and the water powers of every State in the Union.

In spite of the multiplication of labor-saving machines and improved methods in industry which cheapen the cost of production, the share of the producers grows ever less, and the prices of all the necessities of life steadily increase. The boasted prosperity of this Nation is for the owning class alone. To the rest it means only greater hardship and misery. The high cost of living is felt in every home. Millions of wage-workers have seen the purchasing power of their wages decrease until life has become a desperate battle for mere existence.

Multitudes of unemployed walk the streets of our cities or trudge from State to State awaiting the will of the masters to move the wheels of industry.

The farmers in every State are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for tools and machinery and by extortionate freight rates and storage charges.

Capitalist concentration is mercilessly crushing the class of small business men and driving its members into the ranks of propertyless wage-workers. The overwhelming majority of the people of America are being forced under a yoke of bondage by this soulless industrial despotism.

It is this capitalist system that is responsible for the increasing burden of armaments, the poverty, slums, child labor, most of the insanity, crime and prostitution, and much of the disease that afflicts mankind.

Under this system the working class is exposed to poisonous conditions, to frightful and needless perils to life and limb, is walled around with court decisions, injunctions and unjust laws, and is preyed upon incessantly for the benefit of the controlling oligarchy of wealth. Under it also, the children of the working class are doomed to ignorance, drudging toil and darkened lives.

In the face of these evils, so manifest that all thoughtful observers are appalled at them, the legislative representatives of the Republican and Democratic parties remain the faithful servants of the oppressors. Measures designed to secure to the wage-earners of this Nation as humane and just treatment as is already enjoyed by the wage-earners of all other civilized nations have been smothered in committee without debate, and laws ostensibly designed to bring relief to the farmers and general consumers are juggled and transformed into instruments for the exaction of further tribute. The growing unrest under oppression has driven these two old parties to the enactment of a variety of regulative measures, none of which has limited in any appreciable degree the power of the plutocracy, and some of which have been perverted into means for increasing that power. Anti-trust laws, railroad restrictions and regulations, with the prosecutions, indictments and investigations based upon such legislation, have proved to be utterly futile and ridiculous.

Nor has this plutocracy been seriously restrained or even threatened by any Republican or Democratic executive. It has continued to grow in power and insolence alike under the administrations of Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft.

In addition to this legislative juggling and this executive connivance, the courts of America have sanctioned and strengthened the hold of this plutocracy as the Dred Scott and other decisions strengthened the slave power before the civil war.

We declare, therefore, that the longer sufferance of these conditions is impossible, and we purpose to end them all. We declare them to be the product of the present system in which industry is carried on for private greed, instead of for the welfare of society. We declare, furthermore, that for these evils there will be and can be no remedy and no substantial relief except through socialism, under which industry will be carried on for the common good and every worker receive the full social value of the wealth he creates.

Society is divided into warring groups and classes, based upon material interests. Fundamentally, this struggle is a conflict be-

tween the two main classes, one of which, the capitalist class, owns the means of production, and the other, the working class, must use these means of production on terms dictated by the owners.

The capitalist class, though few in numbers, absolutely controls the Government — legislative, executive and judicial. This class owns the machinery of gathering and disseminating news through its organized press. It subsidizes seats of learning — the colleges and schools — and even religious and moral agencies. It has also the added prestige which established customs give to any order of society, right or wrong.

The working class, which includes all those who are forced to work for a living, whether by hand or brain, in shop, mine or on the soil, vastly outnumbers the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity, this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interest.

All political parties are the expression of economic class interests. All other parties than the Socialist party represent one or another group of the ruling capitalist class. Their political conflicts reflect merely superficial rivalries between competing capitalist groups. However they result, these conflicts have no issue of real value to the workers. Whether the Democrats or Republicans win politically, it is the capitalist class that is victorious economically.

The Socialist party is the political expression of the economic interests of the workers. Its defeats have been their defeats and its victories their victories. It is a party founded on the science and laws of social development. It proposes that, since all social necessities to-day are socially produced, the means of their production and distribution shall be socially owned and democratically controlled.

In the face of the economic and political aggressions of the capitalist class the only reliance left the workers is that of their economic organizations and their political power. By the intelligent and class-conscious use of these, they may resist successfully the capitalist class, break the fetters of wage slavery, and fit themselves for the future society, which is to displace the capitalist system. The Socialist party appreciates the full significance of class organization and urges the wage-earners, the working farmers and all other useful workers to organize for economic and political action, and we pledge ourselves to support the toilers of the fields as well as those in the shops, factories and mines of the Nation in their struggles for economic justice.

In the defeat or victory of the working class party in this new struggle for freedom lies the defeat or triumph of the common

people of all economic groups, as well as the failure or the triumph of popular government. Thus the Socialist party is the party of the present-day revolution, which marks the transition from economic individualism to socialism, from wage slavery to free coöperation, from capitalist oligarchy to industrial democracy.

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim, the Coöperative Commonwealth, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following programme:—

First: The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express service, steamboat lines and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

Second: The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the States or the Federal Government, of all grain elevators, stock yards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

Third: The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

Fourth: The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people:—

(a) By scientific forestation and timber protection.

(b) By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.

(c) By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water power.

(d) By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.

(e) By the development of highway and waterway systems.

Fifth: The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation.

Sixth: The collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system.

The immediate Government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the Government under a work day of not more than eight hours and at not less than the prevailing union wages. The Government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to States and municipalities, without interest, for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

INDUSTRIAL DEMANDS

The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families : —

First : By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

Second : By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

Third : By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories and mines.

Fourth : By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

Fifth : By abolishing the brutal exploitation of convicts under the contract system and prohibiting the sale of goods so produced in competition with other labor.

Sixth : By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.

Seventh : By abolishing the profit system in Government work, and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to coöperative groups of workers.

Eighth : By establishing minimum wage scales.

Ninth : By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old-age pensions, a general system of insurance by the State of all its members against unemployment and invalidism and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death.

POLITICAL DEMANDS

First : The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

Second : The adoption of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rates of the present corporation tax and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin — the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.

Third : The gradual reduction of all tariff duties, particularly those on the necessities of life. The government to guarantee the reëmployment of wage-earners who may be disemployed by reason of changes in tariff schedules.

Fourth : The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.

Fifth : Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women.

Sixth: The adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and of proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.

Seventh: The abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.

Eighth: The election of the President and Vice-President by direct vote of the people.

Ninth: The abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of the legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.

Tenth: The abolition of the present restrictions upon the amendment of the Constitution, so that that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in a majority of the States.

Eleventh: The granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia with representation in Congress and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.

Twelfth: The extension of Democratic government to all United States territory.

Thirteenth: The enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits. The Bureau of Education to be made a department.

Fourteenth: The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health. The creation of an independent Bureau of Health, with such restrictions as will secure full liberty to all schools of practice.

Fifteenth: The separation of the present Bureau of Labor from the Department of Commerce and Labor and its elevation to the rank of a department.

Sixteenth: Abolition of all Federal District Courts and the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals. State courts to have jurisdiction in all cases arising between citizens of the several States and foreign corporations. The election of all judges for short terms.

Seventeenth: The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.

Eighteenth: The free administration of justice.

Nineteenth: The calling of a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

Although the foregoing platform covers a wide range of subjects, it does not comprise all the political creed of the Socialist party. For besides the Platform Committee there was also a Committee on Resolutions, which made more than a dozen reports, each on a single topic, supplementing or amplifying the points mentioned in the platform. The resolutions were discussed and adopted, and should really form a part of the platform; but they are too voluminous to be here reproduced. Among the positions taken by the party in those resolutions were: opposition to the restriction of immigration by excluding avowed anarchists; condemnation of the prosecution of the I.W.W. leaders for inciting strikers to violence; approval of a Socialist propaganda in the enlisted forces of the army and navy; recommending temperance, but opposing prohibition; and condemning "white slavery" as a "by-product of capitalism."

The convention adopted a rule forbidding nominating speeches for a candidate for President, because, as one delegate put it, "nominating speeches are in most instances of such a character as to turn the convention from a deliberative body into a howling mob,"—a fact which members of other parties have perceived without its leading to the obvious remedy. On Friday afternoon, the 17th, the convention voted, without preliminaries, for a candidate for President, with the following result:—

Whole number of votes	275
Necessary to a choice	138
Eugene V. Debs, of Illinois	165
Emil Seidel, of Wisconsin	56
Charles Edward Russell, of New York	54

Mr. Seidel moved, and Mr. Russell seconded the motion, to make the nomination unanimous, which was carried.

The vote for a candidate for Vice-President resulted:—

Whole number of votes	256
Necessary to a choice	129
Emil Seidel, of Wisconsin	159
Dan Hogan, of Arkansas	73
John W. Slayton, of Pennsylvania	24

Mr. Seidel's nomination was made unanimous, on motion of Mr. Hogan, seconded by Mr. Slayton.

The convention of the Prohibition party was held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, July 10-12, in a hall at the end of a long pier jutting into the ocean. Some of the delegates felicitated themselves on the appropriateness of meeting in a place wholly surrounded by water. It was reported that all the States were represented "by a thousand or more delegates," but the facts were not more definitely stated. Indeed, the proceedings of the convention were so meagrely reported in the daily newspapers that details are not easily accessible. Clinton N. Howard, of New York, was the temporary chairman, and Dr. Charles H. Mead, of New Jersey, was the permanent president of the convention. There were two quite active contests in the course of the proceedings. An "insurgent" movement was successful, by an amendment of the rules, in giving to the convention the right by a free ballot to make choice of the chairman of the national committee; and complaint that the prohibition plank of the platform as reported by the Committee on Resolutions was inadequate, led to the addition of the concluding clause of the first paragraph of the platform, which, as agreed upon, was as follows:—

The Prohibition Party of the United States of America, in convention at Atlantic City, New Jersey, July 11, 1912, recognizing God as the source of all governmental authority, makes the following declaration of principles:—

The alcoholic drink traffic is wrong, the most serious drain upon the Nation's wealth and resources, detrimental to the general welfare, destructive of the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and therefore, all laws taxing or licensing a traffic that produces crime, poverty, and political corruption, and spreads disease and death, should be repealed. To destroy such traffic there must be elected to power a political party which will administer the Government from the standpoint that the alcoholic drink traffic is a crime and not a business, and we pledge that the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages shall be prohibited.

We favor the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

➤ Presidential terms of six years and one term only.

Uniform marriage and divorce laws.

The extermination of polygamy and the complete suppression of the traffic in girls.

Suffrage for women upon the same terms as to men.

Court review as to post-office decisions.

The absolute protection of the rights of labor without impairment of the rights of capital.

The settlement of all international disputes by arbitration.

The initiative and referendum.

The tariff is a commercial question and should be fixed on the basis of accurate knowledge secured by a permanent omnipartisan tariff commission with ample powers.

An elastic currency system adequate to our industrial needs.

The complete and permanent separation of Church and State.

We oppose the appropriation of public funds for any sectarian purposes.

The abolition of child labor in the mines, workshops, and factories, with rigid enforcement of laws now flagrantly violated.

Equitable graduated income and inheritance taxes.

Conservation of our mineral and forest reserves, reclamation of arid and waste lands, and we urge that all mineral and timber lands and water-power now owned by the Government be held perpetually and leased for revenue purposes.

Clearly defined laws for the regulation and control of corporations transacting an interstate business.

Greater efficiency and economy in government service.

To these fundamental principles the National Prohibition Party renews its long allegiance and on these issues invites the coöperation of all citizens, to the end that the true objects of popular government may be attained ; i. e., equal and exact justice to all.

Five candidates were proposed for President: Eugene W. Chafin, of Arizona ; F. W. Emerson, of California ; Finley C. Hendrickson, of Maryland ; Aaron S. Watkins, of Ohio ; and Andrew Jackson Houston, of Texas. After one vote all the candidates except Mr. Chafin were withdrawn, and he was nominated by acclamation. The leading candidates for Vice-President were Aaron S. Watkins, of Ohio ; F. W. Emerson, of California ; and George E. Stockwell, of New York. Again one vote was taken, and then Mr. Watkins was nominated by acclamation. The ticket was therefore the same as in 1904 and 1908.

It has already been recorded that immediately after the close of the Republican Convention the supporters of Mr. Roosevelt met in Orchestra Hall and laid preliminary plans for the formation of a new party to be led by him. Governor Johnson, of California, presided. Senator Clapp, of Minnesota, declared that those present "represented a clear

majority of the voters of the Republican party in the United States, and a clear majority of the delegates and alternates legally elected to the convention." The meeting tendered a nomination as President to Mr. Roosevelt, and he accepted it. The chairman of the meeting was empowered to name a committee to form plans for a temporary organization and for the holding of a delegate convention. A call for such a convention, to meet at Chicago on August 5, was issued on July 8, addressed "to the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences, who, through repeated betrayals, realize that to-day the power of the crooked political bosses and of the privileged classes behind them is so strong in the two old party organizations that no helpful movement in the real interest of our country can come out of either."

In the organization of a new party the preliminaries are necessarily informal, and must be undertaken by men who have no previous authority. It was so on this occasion. There was neither an enrolment of members nor any of the ordinary party machinery for the choice of delegates. But all difficulties arising from the lack of such preparatory aids were surmounted in one way or another, and a convention undoubtedly representative of the movement was duly assembled. It is not feasible to give so detailed a report of the proceedings as is possible in giving those of the Republican and Democratic conventions. So far as a somewhat careful search reveals, no newspaper in the country gave a connected, or even an intelligible, account of the proceedings, although the newspapers did print many pages of picturesque statements about it. Inasmuch as no official report was published, some facts regarding the convention are not available. It is probable, nevertheless, that all the States were represented, though even that cannot be stated positively; and of course, since there was no roll-call and no division on any question, the total number of delegates cannot be stated. Among the delegates were many women.

Previous to the meeting of the convention Mr. Roosevelt made known his wishes on a certain point regarding the representation of the extreme southern States. He urged that the choice of colored men as delegates, which should be encouraged in the northern States, should be discouraged in the South. He gave several reasons for his opinion, based on the conditions in that part of the country, and the scandals that had accompanied the manipulation of caucuses and conven-

tions by the Republican organizations in recent years. His declaration practically called for delegations exclusively of white men from all the States where the laws or the attitude of those in control of the governments prevented the free exercise of the right of suffrage by the negroes. Undoubtedly Mr. Roosevelt had also in his mind, as a consequence of what is known as a "lily white" policy, that although the Progressives would probably lose some votes of colored men, they would gain many from the Democratic party; and it was a hope and expectation that the movement would tend to create a breach in the "solid South." Indeed, there were some delegates, former Democrats, in the convention from southern States, who brought assurances that Mr. Roosevelt would make great inroads upon the Democratic vote in that region, with good prospect of carrying some of the States. There was a certain amount of opposition to the proposition. It was feared, by some delegates from northern States where the Negro vote was an important element, that the discrimination against the race would cause a loss of strength where such a loss might make the difference between success and failure. But on this matter, as on every other, of principle, policy, or action, the will of the leader was decisive. The National Committee decided to exclude certain colored delegates from southern States, and the convention confirmed its acts. It will be seen, on an examination of the popular vote in November, that so far from the Progressive movement making a breach in the solid South, the combined vote for Roosevelt and Taft in those States was less than the Taft vote in 1908.

In many respects the convention was unique. It would be easy and true to describe it as a Roosevelt convention, but it was much more than that. There could be no mistaking the fervor and enthusiasm of the delegates for the principles of Mr. Roosevelt and for the political and social crusade to which he was leading them. They firmly believed that they were entering upon a movement for the regeneration and emancipation of the American people, and the renovation and purification of American life. They were continually breaking forth into song — religious and patriotic song — "Onward Christian Soldiers," the "Battle Hymn of the Republic"; "America"; and most appropriately they closed the sessions of the convention by singing the Doxology — "Praise God from whom all blessings flow." Psychologically their attitude might be likened to

the militant spirituality of a Salvation Army host, and the likeness is emphasized by the concluding sentence of Mr. Roosevelt's "confession of faith," "We stand at Armageddon, and we battle for the Lord."

The convention was called to order by Senator Dixon, of Montana, who read the call and made a brief address. Albert J. Beveridge, of Indiana, was the temporary chairman, and spoke at great length. He continued to act as presiding officer during all the sessions of the convention. On the second day Mr. Roosevelt was received with extraordinary enthusiasm, and made his "confession of faith." On the third day the platform, which had previously been submitted to Mr. Roosevelt, and approved by him, was reported and unanimously adopted, as follows:—

The conscience of the people in a time of grave national problems has called into being a new party, born of the nation's awakened sense of justice.

We of the Progressive Party here dedicate ourselves to the fulfillment of the duty laid upon us by our fathers to maintain that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whose foundations they laid.

We hold, with Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, that the people are the masters of their Constitution, to fulfill its purposes and to safeguard it from those who, by perversion of its intent, would convert it into an instrument of injustice. In accordance with the needs of each generation the people must use their sovereign powers to establish and maintain equal opportunity and industrial justice, to secure which this government was founded and without which no republic can endure.

This country belongs to the people who inhabit it. Its resources, its business, its institutions, and its laws should be utilized, maintained, or altered in whatever manner will best promote the general interest. It is time to set the public welfare in the first place.

Political parties exist to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people. From these great tasks both the old parties have turned aside. Instead of instruments to promote the general welfare, they have become the tools of corrupt interests which use them impartially to serve their selfish purposes. Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government owning no allegiance and alleging no responsibility to the people. To destroy this invisible government, to dissolve the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics, is the first task of the statesmanship of the day.

The deliberate betrayal of its trust by the Republican Party, the

fatal incapacity of the Democratic Party to deal with the new issues of the new time, have compelled the people to forge a new instrument of government through which to give effect to their will in laws and institutions. Unhampered by tradition, uncorrupted by power, undismayed by the magnitude of the task, the new party offers itself as the instrument of the people to sweep away old abuses, to build a new and nobler commonwealth.

This declaration is our covenant with the people, and we hereby bind the party and its candidates in state and nation to the pledges made herein.

The Progressive Party, committed to the principle of government by a self-controlled democracy expressing its will through representatives of the people, pledges itself to secure such alterations in the fundamental law of the several states and of the United States as shall insure the representative character of the government. In particular, the party declares for direct-primaries for the nomination of state and national officers, for nation-wide preferential primaries for candidates for the Presidency, for the direct election of United States Senators by the people; and we urge on the states the policy of the short ballot with responsibility to the people secured by the initiative, referendum, and recall.

The Progressive Party, believing that a free people should have the power from time to time to amend their fundamental law so as to adopt it progressively to the changing needs of the people, pledges itself to provide a more easy and expeditious method of amending the Federal Constitution.

Up to the limit of the Constitution and later by amendment of the Constitution, if it was found necessary, we advocate bringing under effective national jurisdiction those problems which have expanded beyond reach of the individual states.

It is as grotesque as it is intolerable that the several states should by unequal laws in matter of common concern become competing commercial agencies, barter the lives of their children, the health of their women, and the safety and well-being of their working people for the profit of their financial interests.

The extreme insistence on state's rights by the Democratic Party in the Baltimore platform demonstrates anew its inability to understand the world into which it has survived or to administer the affairs of a union of states which have in all essential respects become one people.

The Progressive Party, believing that no people can justly claim to be a true democracy which denies political right on account of sex, pledges itself to the task of securing equal suffrage to men and women alike.

We pledge our party to legislation that will compel strict lim-

itation of all campaign contributions and expenditures and detailed publicity of both, before as well as after primaries and elections.

We pledge our party to legislation compelling the registration of lobbyists; publicity of committee hearings, except on foreign affairs, and recording of all votes in committee, and forbidding federal appointees from holding office in state or national political organizations or taking part as officers or delegates in political conventions for the nomination of elective state or national officials.

The Progressive Party demands such restriction of the power of the courts as shall leave to the people the ultimate authority to determine fundamental questions of social welfare and public policy. To secure this end, it pledges itself to provide:—

(1) That when an act passed under the police power of the state is held unconstitutional under the state constitution by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become law, notwithstanding such decision.

(2) That every decision of the highest appellate court of a state declaring an act of the legislature unconstitutional on the ground of its violation of the Federal Constitution shall be subject to the same review by the Supreme Court of the United States as is now accorded to decisions sustaining such legislation.

The Progressive Party, in order to secure to the people a better administration of justice and by that means to bring about a more general respect for the law and the courts, pledges itself to work unceasingly for the reform of legal procedure and judicial methods.

We believe that the issuance of injunctions in cases arising out of labor disputes should be prohibited when such injunctions would not apply when no labor disputes existed.

We also believe that a person cited for contempt in labor disputes, except when such contempt was committed in the actual presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere with the proper administration of justice, should have a right to trial by jury.

The supreme duty of the nation is the conservation of human resources through an enlightened measure of social and industrial justice. We pledge ourselves to work unceasingly in state and nation for —

Effective legislation looking to the prevention of industrial accidents, occupational diseases, overwork, involuntary unemployment, and other injurious effects incident to modern industry;

The fixing of minimum safety and health standards for the various occupations, and the exercise of the public authority of state and nation, including the federal control over interstate commerce and the taxing power, to maintain such standards;

The prohibition of child labor; minimum wage standards for working women; to provide a "living wage" in all industrial occupations;

The general prohibition of night work for women, and the establishment of an eight-hour day for women and young persons;

One day's rest in seven for all wage-workers;

The eight-hour day in continuous twenty-four hour industries;

The abolition of the convict contract labor system; substituting a system of prison production for governmental consumption only; and the application of prisoners' earnings to the support of their dependent families;

Publicity as to wages, hours, and conditions of labor; full reports upon industrial accidents and diseases, and the opening to public inspection of all tallies, weights, measures, and check systems on labor products.

We pledge our party to establish a Department of Labor with a seat in the Cabinet, and with wide jurisdiction over matters affecting the conditions of labor and living.

The development and prosperity of country life are as important to the people who live in the cities as they are to the farmers. Increase of prosperity on the farm will favorably affect the cost of living and promote the interests of all who dwell in the country, and all who depend upon its products for clothing, shelter, and food.

We pledge our party to foster the development of agricultural credit and coöperation, the teaching of agriculture in schools, the agricultural college extension, the use of mechanical power on the farm, and to reëstablish the Country Life Commission, thus directly promoting the welfare of the farmers and bringing the benefits of better farming, better business, and better living within their reach.

The high cost of living is due partly to world-wide and partly to local causes; partly to natural and partly to artificial causes. The measures proposed in this platform on various subjects, such as the tariff, the trusts, and conservation, will of themselves remove the artificial causes. There will remain other elements, such as the tendency to leave the country for the city, waste, extravagance, bad system of taxation, poor methods of raising crops, and bad business methods in marketing crops.

To remedy these conditions requires the fullest information and, based on this information, effective government supervision and control to remove all the artificial causes. We pledge ourselves to such full and immediate inquiry and to immediate action to deal with every need such inquiry discloses.

We favor the union of all the existing agencies of the Federal

Government dealing with the public health into a single national health service without discrimination against or for any one set of therapeutic methods, school of medicine, or school of healing, with such additional powers as may be necessary to enable it to perform efficiently such duties in the protection of the public from preventable disease as may be properly undertaken by the federal authorities ; including the executing of existing laws regarding pure food ; quarantine and cognate subjects ; the promotion of appropriate action for the improvement of vital statistics and the extension of the registration area of such statistics ; and coöperation with the health activities of the various states and cities of the nation.

We believe that true popular government, justice, and prosperity go hand in hand, and, so believing, it is our purpose to secure that large measure of general prosperity which is the fruit of legitimate and honest business, fostered by equal justice and by sound progressive laws.

We demand that the test of true prosperity shall be the benefits conferred thereby on all the citizens, not confined to individuals or classes, and that the test of corporate efficiency shall be the ability better to serve the public ; that those who profit by control of business shall justify that profit and control by sharing with the public the fruits thereof.

We therefore demand a strong national regulation of interstate corporations. The corporation is an essential part of modern business. The concentration of modern business in some degree is both inevitable and necessary for national and international business efficiency. But the existing concentration of vast wealth under a corporate system, unguarded and uncontrolled by the nation, has placed in the hands of a few men enormous, secret, irresponsible power over the daily life of the citizen — a power insufferable in a free government and certain of abuse.

This power has been abused, in monopoly of national resources, in stock-watering, in unfair competition and unfair privileges, and finally in sinister influences on the public agencies of state and nation. We do not fear commercial power, but we insist that it shall be exercised openly, under public supervision and regulation of the most efficient sort which will preserve its good while eradicating and preventing its ill.

To that end we urge the establishment of a strong federal administrative commission of high standing which shall maintain permanent active supervision over industrial corporations engaged in interstate commerce, doing for them what the Government now does for the national banks, and what is now done for the railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Such a commission must enforce the complete publicity of those corporate transactions which are of public interest; must attack unfair competition, false capitalization, and special privilege, and by continuous, trained watchfulness guard and keep open, equally to all, the highways of American commerce. Thus the business man will have certain knowledge of the law, and will be able to conduct his business easily in conformity therewith; the investor will find security for his capital; dividends will be rendered more certain, and the savings of the people will be drawn naturally and safely into the channels of trade.

Under such a system of constructive regulation legitimate business, freed from confusion, uncertainty, and fruitless litigation, will develop normally in response to the energy and enterprise of the American business man.

We favor strengthening the Sherman Law by prohibiting agreements to divide territory or limit output; refusing to sell to customers who buy from business rivals; to sell below cost in certain areas while maintaining higher prices in other places; using the power of transportation to aid or injure special business concerns, and other unfair trade practices.

We pledge ourselves to the enactment of a patent law which will make it impossible for patents to be suppressed or used against the public welfare in the interests of injurious monopolies.

We pledge our party to secure to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to value the physical property of railroads. In order that the power of the commission to protect the people may not be impaired or destroyed, we demand the abolition of the Commerce Court.

We believe there exists imperative need for prompt legislation for the improvement of our national currency system. We believe the present method of issuing notes through private agencies is harmful and unscientific. The issue of currency is fundamentally a government function and the system should have as basic principles soundness and elasticity. The control should be lodged with the Government and should be protected from domination or manipulation by Wall Street or any special interests.

We are opposed to the so-called Aldrich Currency Bill because its provisions would place our currency and credit system in private hands, not subject to effective public control.

The time has come when the Federal Government should coöperate with manufacturers and producers in extending our foreign commerce. To this end we demand adequate appropriations by Congress and the appointment of diplomatic and consular officers solely with a view to their special fitness and worth, and not in consideration of political expediency.

It is imperative to the welfare of our people that we enlarge and extend our foreign commerce. In every way possible our Federal Government should coöperate in this important matter. Germany's policy of coöperation between government and business has in comparatively few years made that nation a leading competitor for the commerce of the world.

The natural resources of the nation must be promptly developed and generously used to supply the people's needs, but we cannot safely allow them to be wasted, exploited, monopolized, or controlled against the general good. We heartily favor the policy of conservation, and we pledge our party to protect the national forests without hindering their legitimate use for the benefit of all the people. Agricultural lands in the national forests are and should remain open to the genuine settler. Conservation will not retard legitimate development. The honest settler must receive his patent promptly without hindrance, rules, or delays.

We believe that the remaining forests, coal and oil lands, water-powers, and other natural resources, still in state or national control (except agricultural lands), are more likely to be wisely conserved and utilized for the general welfare if held in the public hands. In order that consumers and producers, managers and workmen, now and hereafter, need not pay toll to private monopolies of power and raw material, we demand that such resources shall be retained by the state or nation, and opened to immediate use under laws which will encourage development and make to the people a moderate return for benefits conferred.

In particular we pledge our party to require reasonable compensation to the public for water-power rights hereafter granted by the public. We pledge legislation to lease the public grazing lands under equitable provisions now pending which will increase the production of food for the people and thoroughly safeguard the rights of the actual homemakers. Natural resources whose conservation is necessary for the national welfare should be owned or controlled by the nation.

We recognize the vital importance of good roads, and we pledge our party to foster their extension in every proper way, and we favor the early construction of national highways. We also favor the extension of the rural free delivery service.

The coal and other natural resources of Alaska should be opened to development at once. They are owned by the people of the United States and are safe from monopoly, waste, or destruction only while so owned. We demand that they shall neither be sold nor given away except under the Homestead Law, but while held in government ownership shall be opened to use promptly upon liberal terms requiring immediate development.

Thus the benefit of cheap fuel will accrue to the Government of the United States and to the people of Alaska and the Pacific Coast; the settlement of extensive agricultural lands will be hastened; the extermination of the salmon will be prevented, and the just and wise development of Alaskan resources will take the place of private extortion of monopoly. We demand also that extortion or monopoly in transportation shall be prevented by the prompt acquisition, construction, or improvement by the Government of such railroads, harbor, and other facilities for transportation as the welfare of the people may demand.

We promise the people of the Territory of Alaska the same measure of local self-government that was given to other American Territories, and that federal officials appointed there shall be qualified by previous *bona fide* residence in the territory.

The rivers of the United States are the natural arteries of this continent. We demand that they shall be opened to traffic as indispensable parts of a great nation-wide system of transportation, in which the Panama Canal will be the central link, thus enabling the whole interior of the United States to share with the Atlantic and Pacific seaboard in the benefit derived from the canals.

It is a national obligation to develop our rivers, and especially the Mississippi and its tributaries, without delay, under a comprehensive general plan covering each river system from its source to its mouth, designed to secure its highest usefulness for navigation, irrigation, domestic supply, water-power, and the prevention of floods. We pledge our party to the immediate preparation of such a plan which should be made and carried out in close and friendly coöperation between the nation, the state, and the cities affected.

Under such a plan, the destructive floods of the Mississippi and other streams, which represent a vast and needless loss to the nation, would be controlled by forest conservation and water storage at the headwaters and by levees below, land sufficient to support millions of people would be reclaimed from the deserts and swamps, water-power enough to transform the industrial standing of whole states would be developed, adequate water terminals would be provided, transportation would revive, and the railroads would be compelled to coöperate as freely with the boat lines as with each other.

The equipment, organization, and experience acquired in constructing the Panama Canal soon will be available for the lakes-to-the-gulf deep waterway and other portions of this great work, and should be utilized by the nation in coöperation with the various states, at the lowest net cost to the people.

The Panama Canal, built and paid for by the American people,

must be used primarily for their benefit. We demand that the canal shall be so operated as to break the transportation monopoly now held and misused by the transcontinental railroads by maintaining sea competition with them, that ships directly or indirectly owned or controlled by American railroad corporations shall not be permitted to use the canal, and that American ships engaged in coastwise trade shall pay no tolls.

The Progressive Party will favor legislation having for its aim the development of friendship and commerce between the United States and Latin-American nations.

We believe in a protective tariff which shall equalize conditions of competition between the United States and foreign countries, both for the farmer and the manufacturer, and which shall maintain for labor an adequate standard of living. Primarily the benefit of any tariff should be disclosed in the pay envelope of the laborer. We declare that no industry deserves protection which is unfair to labor or which is operating in violation of federal law. We believe that the presumption is always in favor of the consuming public.

We demand tariff revision because the present tariff is unjust to the people of the United States. Fair dealing toward the people requires an immediate downward revision of those schedules wherein duties are shown to be unjust or excessive.

We pledge ourselves to the establishment of a non-partisan scientific tariff commission, reporting both to the President and to either branch of Congress, which shall report, — first, as to the costs of production, efficiency of labor, capitalization, industrial organization and efficiency, and the general competitive position in this country and abroad of industries seeking protection from Congress; second, as to the revenue-producing power of the tariff and its relation to the resources of Government; and third, as to the effect of the tariff on prices, operations of middle men, and on the purchasing power of the consumer. We believe that this commission should have plenary power to elicit information and for this purpose to prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the great protected industries. The work of the commission should not prevent the immediate adoption of acts reducing those schedules generally recognized as excessive.

We condemn the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill as unjust to the people. The Republican organization is in the hands of those who have broken, and cannot be again trusted to keep, the promise of necessary downward revision. The Democratic Party is committed to the destruction of the protective system through a tariff for revenue only — a policy which would inevitably produce widespread industrial and commercial disaster. We demand the immediate repeal of the Canadian Reciprocity Act.

We believe in a graduated inheritance tax as a national means of equalizing the obligations of holders of property to government, and we hereby pledge our party to enact such a federal law as will tax large inheritances, returning to the states an equitable percentage of all amounts collected. We favor the ratification of the pending amendment to the Constitution giving the Government power to levy an income tax.

The Progressive Party deplores the survival in our civilization of the barbaric system of warfare among nations, with its enormous waste of resources even in time of peace and the consequent impoverishment of the life of the toiling masses.

We pledge the party to use its best endeavors to substitute judicial and other peaceful means of settling international differences.

We favor an international agreement for the limitation of naval forces. Pending such an agreement, and as the best means of preserving peace, we pledge ourselves to maintain for the present the policy of building two battleships a year.

We pledge our party to protect the rights of American citizenship at home and abroad. No treaty should receive the sanction of our Government which discriminates between American citizens because of birthplace, race, or religion, or that does not recognize the absolute right of expatriation.

Through the establishment of industrial standards we propose to secure to the able-bodied immigrant and to his native fellow-workers, a larger share of American opportunity.

We denounce the fatal policy of indifference and neglect which has left our enormous immigrant population to become the prey of chance and cupidity. We favor governmental action to encourage the distribution of immigrants away from the congested cities, to rigidly supervise all private agencies dealing with them, and to promote their assimilation, education, and advancement.

We pledge ourselves to a wise and just policy of pensioning American soldiers and sailors and their widows and children by the Federal Government.

And we approve the policy of the Southern States in granting pensions to the ex-Confederate soldiers and sailors and their widows and children.

We pledge our party to the immediate creation of a parcels post with rates proportionate to distance and service.

We condemn the violations of the Civil Service Law under the present administration, including the coercion and assessment of subordinate employes, and the President's refusal to punish such violation after a finding of guilty by his own commission; his distribution of patronage among subservient Congressmen, while withholding it from those who refuse to support administration

measures; his withdrawal of nominations from the Senate until political support for himself was secured, and his open use of the offices to reward those who voted for his renomination.

To eradicate these abuses, we demand not only the enforcement of the Civil Service Act in letter and spirit, but also legislation which will bring under the competitive system postmasters, collectors, marshals, and all other non-political officers, as well as the enactment of an equitable retirement law, and we also insist upon continued service during good behavior and efficiency.

We pledge our party to readjustment of the business methods of the National Government and a proper coördination of the federal bureaus which will increase the economy and efficiency of the government service, prevent duplications, and secure better results to the taxpayers for every dollar expended.

The people of the United States are swindled out of many millions of dollars every year, through worthless investments. The plain people, the wage-earner, and the men and women with small savings, have no way of knowing the merit of concerns sending out highly colored prospectuses offering stock for sale, prospectuses that make big returns seem certain and fortunes easily within grasp.

We hold it to be the duty of the Government to protect its people from this kind of piracy. We, therefore, demand wise, carefully-thought-out legislation that will give us such governmental supervision over this matter as will furnish to the people of the United States this much-needed protection, and we pledge ourselves thereto.

On these principles and on the recognized desirability of uniting the progressive forces of the nation into an organization which shall unequivocally represent the progressive spirit and policy we appeal for the support of all American citizens, without regard to previous political affiliations. ↓

After the adoption of the platform Mr. Roosevelt was nominated as candidate for President, by acclamation. The nominating speeches were extremely laudatory. A striking feature of that part of the proceedings was the speech of Miss Jane Addams, seconding the nomination. Hardly less interesting were the speeches proposing Governor Hiram W. Johnson, of California, as candidate for Vice-President, who also was nominated by acclamation.

The ensuing canvass, that culminated in the election of November, 1912, forms a chapter in our political history of which no American should be proud. It was an era of misrepresentation, unreasoning rancor, and mud-throwing. There

was no need of active campaigning on the part of the Democrats; their divided enemies relieved them of anxiety, for the two factions, or rather the two parties, were too much occupied with mutual denunciation to spare any time in warfare against the party that both had previously held up to popular condemnation as the embodiment of evil. Republicans affected to belittle the Progressive movement, to sneer at it as a one-man affair, and persuaded themselves that it would end in complete failure. The Progressives were truly amazed at the spontaneous thronging of old-time Republicans to their banner, and exultingly announced that the future was theirs. They firmly believed that the Republican party was dead beyond resurrection, like the Whig party of the nineteenth century. Their devotion to the cause they had espoused was almost fanatical in its intensity. Something of the tone, akin to religious fervor, that had characterized their convention, survived in their campaigning. They seemed to regard those from whom they had but just separated themselves — party associates of a lifetime — somewhat as a fresh convert feels toward the bad companions of the past — bad only because they have not followed him to the “anxious seat.” “Thou shalt not steal!” — often uttered on the platform and in the press — was both their favorite rebuke to those with whom they could no longer keep company and a self-comforting assumption of virtue.

“Thou shalt not bear false witness!” was the retort. The accusation of theft had reference, of course, to the refusal of the Chicago convention to seat two or three score of Roosevelt contestants. The evidence in all those cases was available, and the Republican Committee published it, and — to its own satisfaction at least — proved that the contests were decided rightly. The Progressives made no attempt to put forth a counter-analysis of the contested election evidence. Their accusation had accomplished all that they had hoped from it.

Upon a careful study of the whole affair one can see that the manner in which the Republican party was to break in twain is the only thing that could not have been foreseen. The breach itself was inevitable. If the upshot of the convention had been different, if the control had been in the hands of the Roosevelt faction, and if they had placed the ex-President in nomination on such a platform as they framed in August, those who supported Mr. Taft could not have transferred their support

to the extreme Progressive candidate and his declaration of principles. There was no personal, no moral, no political bond that held the two factions together.

It would not be useful to give a detailed history of the canvass, from August to November. All the candidates made political speeches, and each advanced reasons more to the point why the others should not be elected than why he himself should be. The only dramatic incident of the time was an attempt upon the life of Mr. Roosevelt while he was making a political speech. He was shot and injured somewhat, but not very seriously. The assault created sympathy for him, and there was some suspension of political campaigning for a short time. But he was soon again active on the stump.

Since the Ten Commandments were so often quoted as political maxims, it is strange that it did not occur to the partisans either of Mr. Taft or of Mr. Roosevelt to hurl the tenth at the Democrats: "Thou shalt not covet!" For they were eagerly and gleefully preparing to seize and appropriate that which was still their neighbors', while those neighbors were wrathfully quarrelling over it. And they were sure of gaining possession of it. Queerly enough, both of the factions whom they were opposing also professed confidence in the result. The conflicting claims did not deceive dispassionate observers. A correspondent who accompanied Mr. Roosevelt on his western tour published, a full month before the election, a forecast that proved to be remarkably accurate. His main conclusions were that in all the western States except Utah Taft was out of the race, and would run "a bad third"; that Wilson was well in the lead; that through fear of Roosevelt many Taft men would vote for Wilson; that the rural districts were stronger for Roosevelt than the cities; and so on. Practically every one of those predictions was ultimately verified by the result.

The Republicans were in an exasperating situation in several of the States by reason of the fact that candidates for electors had been nominated by the same conventions that chose delegates to the national convention. In those States where Roosevelt delegates had been successful the proposed electors were also partisans of the Progressive candidate. Some of them, even after the split, declined to withdraw. If they had persisted, and if the issue of the election had been different, a very singular situation might have developed, that, namely, of electors chosen by one party supporting the candidates for President

and Vice-President of a violently hostile party. In no less than sixteen States there were Roosevelt men on the Republican electoral tickets, and it was only two or three weeks before the fateful day in November that those tickets were "purged" in all the States except California. The Progressives were in full control of the Republican "machine" in that State, and refused to allow any ticket to be voted therein that was composed of men loyal to the candidates of the party.

The popular and electoral votes are shown on page 302.

The total vote for all candidates in 1912 was 14,937,351, as compared with 14,885,989 in 1908. The increase in four years, only 51,362, was less than the 73,098 votes of the new States of Arizona and New Mexico. Indeed, the Roosevelt and Taft strength combined was not as great as the Taft vote four years before by 109,335; and the Democratic vote was less by 145,724. Considering the undoubted fact that there was a large increase in the number of persons entitled to vote, the special increase of potential and actual voters in the Pacific States by the extension of the franchise to women, and the extremely active campaigning with the object of drawing out a full vote, the result in this particular is not easily explained. An examination of a table which follows will show that the only regions of the country where the aggregate poll was as large for the two — or three — parties, were New England and the Pacific States.

One would be rash to analyze the results of the election with confidence. Of course every one knows that there were waves and counter-waves great and small, in the political ocean, but to assign its definite effect to each and thus to discover the resultant of forces would be an act of political temerity. The grand wave was that which separated the Progressives from the Republican party, but the bare figures do not indicate accurately the magnitude of that wave. The vote for Roosevelt exceeded that for Taft by 634,551. Does that mean that more than four million Republicans deserted their party — more than one-half of those who voted for Taft in 1908? Possibly, but not certainly. For there were two other movements, at least, at the same time, one of which increased the Roosevelt vote at the expense of the Democrats; the other, and probably the larger, diminished the vote for Taft for the benefit of the Democrats. There were Democrats of the radical faction who feared the conservatism of their own candidate

1912

STATES	POPULAR VOTE						ELECTORAL VOTE		
	Wilson and Marshall Democratic	Roosevelt and Johnson Progressive	Taft and Sherman Republican	Chafin and Watkins Prohibition	Debs and Seidel Socialist	Reimer and Francis Socialist Labor	Wilson and Marshall	Roosevelt and Johnson	Taft and Sherman
Alabama	82,439	22,689	9,731	..	3,029	..	12
Arizona	10,324	6,949	3,021	265	3,163	..	3
Arkansas.....	68,838	21,673	24,297	898	8,153	..	9
California.....	283,436	283,610	3,914	23,366	79,201	..	2	11	..
Colorado.....	114,223	72,306	58,386	5,063	16,418	..	6
Connecticut.....	74,561	34,129	68,324	2,068	70,056	475	7
Delaware.....	22,631	8,886	15,998	623	556	1,260	3
Florida.....	36,417	4,535	4,279	1,854	4,806	..	6
Georgia.....	93,171	22,010	5,190	147	1,014	..	14
Idaho.....	33,921	25,527	32,810	1,527	11,960	..	4
Illinois.....	405,048	386,478	253,613	15,710	81,278	4,066	29
Indiana.....	281,890	162,007	151,267	19,249	36,931	3,130	15
Iowa.....	185,325	161,819	119,805	8,440	16,967	..	13
Kansas.....	143,670	120,123	74,844	..	26,807	..	10
Kentucky.....	219,584	102,766	115,512	3,233	11,647	956	13
Louisiana.....	60,966	9,323	3,834	..	5,249	..	10
Maine.....	51,113	48,493	26,545	945	2,541	..	6
Maryland.....	112,674	57,786	54,956	2,244	3,896	322	8
Massachusetts.....	173,408	142,228	155,948	2,754	12,616	1,102	18
Michigan.....	150,751	214,584	152,244	8,934	23,211	1,252	..	15	..
Minnesota.....	106,426	125,856	64,334	7,886	27,505	2,212	..	12	..
Mississippi.....	57,164	3,627	1,511	..	2,017	..	10
Missouri.....	330,746	124,371	207,821	5,380	28,466	1,778	18
Montana.....	27,941	22,456	18,512	32	10,885	..	4
Nebraska.....	109,008	72,689	54,216	3,383	10,885	..	8
Nevada.....	7,986	5,620	3,196	..	3,313	..	3
New Hampshire.....	34,724	17,794	32,927	535	1,981	..	4
New Jersey.....	178,289	145,410	88,835	2,878	15,801	1,321	14
New Mexico.....	20,437	8,347	17,733	..	2,859	..	3
New York.....	655,475	390,021	455,428	19,427	63,381	4,251	45
North Carolina.....	144,507	69,130	29,139	117	1,025	..	12
North Dakota.....	29,555	25,726	23,009	1,243	6,966	..	5
Ohio.....	423,152	229,327	277,066	11,459	89,930	2,623	24
Oklahoma.....	119,156	..	90,786	2,185	42,262	..	10
Oregon.....	47,064	37,600	34,673	4,360	13,343	..	5
Pennsylvania.....	395,619	447,426	273,305	19,533	83,164	704	..	38	..
Rhode Island.....	30,142	16,878	27,703	616	2,049	236	5
South Carolina.....	48,355	1,293	536	..	164	..	9
South Dakota.....	48,942	58,811	..	3,910	4,662	5	..
Tennessee.....	130,335	53,725	59,444	825	3,492	..	12
Texas.....	221,589	26,755	23,853	1,738	25,743	442	20
Utah.....	36,579	24,174	42,100	..	9,023	509	4
Vermont.....	15,350	22,070	23,305	1,154	928	4
Virginia.....	90,332	21,777	23,288	709	820	50	12
Washington.....	86,840	113,698	70,445	9,810	40,134	1,872	..	7	..
West Virginia.....	113,197	79,112	56,754	4,517	15,248	..	8
Wisconsin.....	164,409	58,661	130,878	8,467	34,168	698	13
Wyoming.....	15,310	9,232	14,560	434	2,760	..	3
Total.....	6,293,019	4,119,507	3,484,956	207,828	901,873	29,259	435	88	8

and who admired Mr. Roosevelt. On the other hand there were Republicans who, either from dissatisfaction with Mr. Taft on account of his reciprocity policy or on account of his action on other public questions, or from fear that Mr. Roosevelt would be successful, voted for Mr. Wilson. It would be mere guess-work to estimate the relative importance of these several movements; or to determine definitely whether it is true, as has been hastily assumed, that more than one-half of the Republicans went over to the Progressive candidate; or to account for a decrease of one-fifth in the Prohibition vote, at a time when the prohibitionist idea seemed to be carrying all before it in many parts of the country; or to explain the doubling of the Socialist vote when there was no outward manifestation of a growth of political socialism.

Nevertheless it may interest some students of the political tendencies of the time to seek enlightenment by extracting whatever significance there may be in the subjoined table, which shows the vote at the last two elections by geographical sections. The only explanation of the grouping of the States that is necessary, aside from that given in the notes, is that the States designated as the "extreme South" are those where it is not deemed worth while for either Democrats or Republicans to go to the polls. The total number of votes cast in the eight States for all candidates was 926,079; the population in 1910 was more than sixteen and a half million; that is, about fifty-five votes to a thousand of the population.

	Bryan 1908	Wilson 1912	Taft 1908	Roosevelt 1912	Taft 1912
New England.....	329,058	379,298	582,411	281,592	334,752
Middle States ¹	1,298,820	1,229,383	1,881,175	982,857	817,568
Middle South ²	1,322,020	1,261,668	1,262,839	517,449	654,707
Extreme South ³ ..	664,284	690,433	214,154	112,009	77,222
Near West ⁴	2,126,153	1,863,253	2,731,720	1,405,688	1,213,933
Middle West ⁵	305,559	298,674	488,024	291,782	195,406
Pacific ⁶	362,088	539,549	517,465	512,834	170,614
Total	6,407,982	6,262,258	7,677,788	4,104,211	3,464,202

¹ New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania.

² Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, West Virginia.

³ Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia.

⁴ Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin.

⁵ Idaho, Montana, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming.

⁶ California, Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, Washington.

There was a quick subsidence of excitement at once after the election. Indeed, the result had been generally foreseen, and the only occasion for surprise was the extent of the Progressive inroad upon the Republican forces and the insignificant electoral vote given to Taft. The count of the vote in the joint session of Congress presented no incident worthy of mention.

The inauguration of Wilson and Marshall on the 4th of March, 1913, was an unusually brilliant occasion. Democrats throughout the country celebrated the return of their party to full control of the government after a long period of exclusion. The throng of strangers in Washington was reported to have been larger than at any previous inauguration, and the visitors were favored with pleasant weather. Mr. Wilson passed from his hotel to the White House, before the ceremony, through a double line of Princeton students. President Taft accompanied him to the Capitol, and also on his return to the White House. The ceremonies followed the usual course. The oath of office was administered to Vice-President Marshall in the Senate Chamber; and the Supreme Court, the President-elect, and both Houses of Congress then proceeded to the east front of the Senate wing, where the oath was administered to Mr. Wilson by Chief Justice White. A procession of many thousands escorted the new President to his official residence, where he reviewed it, and the new administration had come into being.

V

THE EVOLUTION OF THE PRESIDENCY

IF a member of the Convention that framed the Constitution were to come back to earth, what feature of the present situation would most astonish him? That the population of less than four millions in 1790 had grown into a nation of more than ninety millions in 1910? That the area of the Union had increased from 900,000 square miles to more than 3,000,000, — not to mention island possessions in two oceans? That the government which the Convention devised had endured for nearly a century and a quarter, and was more united and more stable at the end of the period than at the beginning? That the government had not only endured, but had remained unchanged, so far as the written Constitution was concerned, except in minor and unimportant details?

After all, is not that last-mentioned fact the most astonishing of all? The fathers undoubtedly expected expansion and growth, for they provided for it. They might have hoped, with many a doubt, that their work would be lasting, for they declared their purpose to be the creation of “a more perfect union.” But they could not have anticipated that — granted such a growth as the country has experienced — radical changes would not be found necessary, that their Constitution would prove self-adaptable to conditions enormously modified. In that fact more than in any other lies the explanation of the political miracle of the American Republic — the adaptability of the Constitution.

Each of the three great divisions of the government has found an elasticity in the terms of the Constitution which has enabled it to discharge duties and to meet conditions that could not have been foreseen when that Constitution was framed. The Supreme Court, in which resides the plenary form of the Judicial Department, has assumed and exercises without question the power of construing the laws according to the spirit of the Constitution, — a power which even Hamilton declared¹ was not directly conferred, and which he thought it

¹ See No. LXXXI of the *Federalist*.

unlikely that the Court would exercise. Congress has discovered implied powers in the specific grants contained in the eighth section of the first article, by the use of which it takes complete and undisputed jurisdiction over matters and industries unknown to the eighteenth century. One can fancy Luther Martin, the great objector, opening his eyes over a construction of the clause granting power to lay taxes, under which Congress passes an act having for its sole object a prohibition of the use of a certain ingredient in the manufacture of matches; or of the clause granting power to regulate commerce as justifying a requirement that railway cars shall be equipped with air brakes.

But it is in the Executive Department that the largest development has taken place, and the development of the greatest constitutional significance. It is the only one of the three departments in which development has been in any degree at the expense of either of the other two. The Constitution does not make an absolute separation of powers, but it defines the limits of the participation of each department in the field assigned to the other two. Of the Executive Department alone can it be asserted that it has exceeded those limits. Whether the assertion be true or false — and upon that no opinion is at present expressed — two remarks may be made: first, that there has been no violation of the letter of the Constitution in the evolution of the presidency; and, second, that there has been no general, indeed, hardly an occasional and sporadic, objection to the increase of the President's power. As in the cases of the Supreme Court and of Congress, popular acquiescence may be held to have justified a real constitutional change which has not found expression in an amendment.

Nevertheless it is necessary to make note of the changes that have taken place, and to follow them historically.

The founders of our republics . . . seem never for a moment to have turned their eyes from the danger to liberty from the overgrown and all-grasping prerogative of an hereditary magistrate, supported and fortified by an hereditary branch of the legislative authority. They seem never to have recollected the danger from legislative usurpations, which, by assembling all power into the same hands, must lead to the same tyranny as is threatened by executive usurpations.

So wrote Madison in number XLVII of the "Federalist." He was discussing the distribution of powers between the

President and Congress, in the Constitution which the writers of the "Federalist" were endeavoring to persuade the people of New York to ratify. His argument was, in effect, that encroachments upon liberty are always to be guarded against, whether the offender be the executive, concentrated in a single person, or in the legislature; and that the Constitution provided ample security against the danger in either form. His opinion evidently was that the more immediate danger was that from legislative usurpation. "The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity, and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex."¹ That the peril thus signalized was foremost in the minds of the framers of the Constitution, is made plainly evident by an examination of the document itself. The functions which were conferred upon Congress, and those which were forbidden to it, are specified with minuteness. On the other hand, the powers of the President are expressed in broad and general terms, and are accompanied by no prohibitions. Let us see what, exactly, those powers are: in conjunction with the Senate, to make treaties, and to appoint all officers; to receive ambassadors; to be commander-in-chief of the army and navy; to grant pardons; to give to Congress information of the state of the union; to summon Congress in extraordinary session; to recommend measures to the consideration of Congress; to exercise a qualified veto upon legislation. These are all powers, as distinguished from duties, because all of them call for the exercise of a discretion whether on any given occasion to use them or not. The sole duty imposed upon him is to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

It is a commonplace to all who have studied the political history of the country that the early Presidents took a modest view of their power in the government. No President has ever assumed direct personal command of the army or the navy. From the beginning the Presidents exercised a controlling power over the foreign relations, and maintained with spirit their

¹ In this passage Mr. Madison unconsciously or deliberately, repeated himself. In his diary of the Convention for July 17, 1787, occurs the following: "Mr. Madison was not apprehensive of being thought to favor any step towards monarchy. The real object with him was to prevent its introduction. Experience had proved a tendency in our governments to throw all power into the legislative vortex. The executives of the States are in general little more than cyphers; the legislatures omnipotent. If no effectual check be devised for restraining the instability & encroachments of the latter, a revolution of some kind or other would be inevitable."

prerogative of initiative in all such matters as the negotiation of treaties and the recognition of foreign governments. They have also successfully resisted, as well as resented, attempts to draw from them the details of instructions to American plenipotentiaries, and of correspondence with foreign governments, which they deemed it to be for the public welfare to withhold. But there were in the early days no other than the most formal official relations between the President and the Congress. It was the function of Congress to initiate and pass laws; that of the President to approve or disapprove them when presented to him.

Students of public and official life in New York and Philadelphia during Washington's presidency know that the partisan opposition to the Father of his Country dwelt upon his asserted liking for the fashions of a monarchical court; upon his firmness in the conduct of foreign affairs, as in the matter of the Jay Treaty; upon the vigor displayed in the suppression of the Whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania. Senator William Maclay criticised him as wishing to "subjugate" the Senate because it was not provided in the bills creating the executive departments that the Senate was to be consulted in the matter of the removal of the heads of those departments.¹

The makers of the Constitution devoted much time and discussion to the Executive Department, but hardly any to the consideration of matters with which we are now concerned. They made many contradictory decisions upon the questions whether there should be a single Executive; how he should be chosen; the length of his tenure of the office; whether he should or should not be eligible for reëlection; whether his veto should be absolute or qualified, and if qualified whether a two-thirds or three-fourths vote should be required to override it. There was almost no discussion of the clauses specifying his powers and duties — of the clauses in the phraseology finally agreed upon, no discussion at all.

Let us now consider in what directions and to what extent the presidency has been extended and developed since the Con-

¹ It is interesting to note, as illustrating the great differences of opinion as to the effect of the Constitution before that effect had manifested itself in practice, that Mr. James Wilson, also of Pennsylvania, in discussing this very subject of the participation of the Senate in appointments by the President, — in the session of September 6, in the Convention of 1787, — maintained that the proposed Constitution created an aristocracy, by "throwing a dangerous power into the hands of the Senate."

stitution was put in operation. As for certain plenary powers there could be no expansion. The general command of the military and naval forces; the grant of pardons; the summoning of one or both houses of Congress in extraordinary session; the negotiation of treaties to be ratified by the Senate; and the nomination of officers to be confirmed by the Senate;—these are all powers explicitly conferred without qualification; and the duty of seeing that the laws be faithfully executed also rests upon the President alone. The right to receive ambassadors, as has been said already, was, in early days, construed to give the President power to recognize, or to refuse to recognize, a revolutionary government, by deciding whether or not to receive a person accredited as a diplomatic representative of that government. His right thus to fix its relation—or want of relation—to the government of the United States has been often disputed on the floor of both houses of Congress, but there is believed to be no example of an effective overruling of the President's decision. The exercise of the power may be treated as a natural and not unreasonable extension of a power specifically conferred, and the power itself as one which—not being derivable from any grant to Congress, and yet necessarily within the jurisdiction of some department of every sovereign government—falls obviously to that department which has primarily the oversight of foreign relations.

Outside of the powers and duties just mentioned, as to only one of which has there ever been any dispute, there are three directions in which the presidency has extended itself largely: in the matter of removals from office; in the use of the veto power; and in the relations between the President and Congress. We will take them in the above order.

The Convention of 1787 discussed repeatedly the method of appointment of the civil officers of the United States, but did not once consider the general subject of removals. Mr. Gouverneur Morris submitted a plan for a Council of State, consisting of the Chief Justice and five heads of departments, each of whom was to “be liable to impeachment and removal from office, for neglect of duty, malversation, or corruption”; but it was merely referred to the Committee of Detail and heard from no more. With that exception, and with the further exception of some consideration of the removability of judges, the corollary that appointment in numerous cases implies previous

removal from office, was not once mentioned. The omission was quickly perceived by the opponents of the Constitution, who made the objection that whereas appointments were required to have the consent of the Senate, the President would exercise the right of removal alone. Hamilton¹ held the opposite opinion. "The consent of that body [the Senate] would be necessary," he wrote, "to displace as well as to appoint." So evidently thought Mr. Justice Story, although he expressed himself in guarded language. His "Commentaries on the Constitution" was written during the administration of Andrew Jackson, whose wholesale removals from office — characterized by Story as an "extraordinary change of system" — has, he says, "awakened general attention, and brought back the whole controversy with regard to the executive power of removal to a severe scrutiny. Many of the most eminent statesmen in the country have expressed a deliberate opinion that it is utterly indefensible, and that the only sound interpretation of the Constitution is that avowed upon its adoption; that is to say, that the power of removal belongs to the appointing power."

Chancellor Kent wrote his "Commentaries" a few years earlier, in the administration of John Quincy Adams, before the "extraordinary change of system" took place, and his opinion was different. He held that the construction in favor of the President's exclusive power of removal was "supported by the weighty reason that the subordinate officers in the Executive Department ought to hold at the pleasure of the head of that Department, because he is invested generally with the executive authority, and every participation in that authority by the Senate was an exception to a general principle, and ought to be taken strictly. The President is the great responsible officer for the faithful execution of the law, and the power of removal was incidental to that duty, and might often be requisite to fulfil it."

Both Kent and Story refer, with expressions of amazement, to the strangely haphazard way in which the current interpretation of the Constitution became effective. But they do not mention the occasion on which the question was first raised. For information on that point we are indebted to the frank and racy diary of William Maclay, one of the first senators from Pennsylvania. Less than two months after the inauguration of

¹ In No. LXXVII of the *Federalist*.

Washington as President (April 30, 1789), Mr. John Jay — who at that time held no office¹ — “came in,” wrote Mr. Maclay, and informed the Senate that Mr. Jefferson wished to return from France, and that the President nominated William Short as his successor as Minister to France. This was on June 17. Apparently it was the first nomination ever sent to the Senate, for Mr. Maclay says that the Vice-President immediately began telling the senators how they were to give their “advice and consent.” Two days later Mr. Maclay made a speech on the constitutional problem involved. Had the President a right, by himself alone, to give Mr. Jefferson leave of absence? If the Senate should choose to negative his return it would be necessary only to refuse to confirm Mr. Short or any one else in his place.

In July the bill for organizing the Department of Foreign Affairs came up to the Senate from the House of Representatives. It contained a clause, innocent at first sight, providing that the Secretary should appoint a chief clerk who was to discharge the duties of the office “whenever the said principal officer shall be removed from office by the President of the United States.” The clause had been vigorously attacked in the House of Representatives, but had been allowed to stand. Now a renewed attack was made upon it. From Mr. Maclay’s account of the debate, which lasted several days, it is easy to see that the discussion was animated and angry. There are references in the diary to the efforts of the “court party” to save the clause, and certain senators are mentioned by name as having “recanted” and become supporters of the clause after speaking against it. When the vote was taken it was a tie — ten to ten. “The Vice-President with joy cried out, ‘It is not a vote!’ without giving himself time to declare the division of the House and give his vote in order.” The interpretation thus casually put upon the Constitution by the casting vote of the Vice-President was not seriously challenged for more than three quarters of a century.

The early Presidents used the power of removal sparingly. Washington removed only nine officers during his eight years of service, and in every case the removal was for cause. The two Adamses, Madison, and Monroe also exercised great forbearance. Jefferson used his power a little more freely, but he

¹ Unless his appointment as Foreign Secretary under the Articles of Confederation was still effective.

expressly disclaimed the right to remove for differences of political opinion, or otherwise than for some clear public good. During the administration of Monroe, the "era of good feelings," there were not two parties. All men professed themselves to be Republicans. Party spirit was reinvoked in the administration of the second Adams; but he refused to punish with dismissal officers who placed themselves in opposition to his administration, and the officers whom he left in office at the end of his term were not generally men whom he had appointed, and they were by no means persons selected with a view to promoting his own political future. There was therefore no reason, other than to reward those who had supported him in the canvass of 1828, that can be assigned as the motive of General Jackson's immediate and radical change of system. Within one year from the time of his entry upon office he dismissed two hundred and forty-three officers, including nearly all in the diplomatic, treasury, and civil court services, and his Postmaster-General removed four hundred and ninety-one postmasters. Story, who gives these figures in a note,¹ credits them to a speech of Mr. Clayton in the Senate, March 4, 1830, and says that they are "confessedly imperfect." He also says that it is not probable that the aggregate of removals during the forty years preceding Jackson's administration amounted to one third of the number of Jackson's removals in a single year.

The opponents of the President regarded his action as a great scandal, but the theory on which it was based was defended by his supporters. The classic defence was contained in a speech by William L. Marcy in the Senate in January, 1832.² In speaking of the politicians of the time he said, "When they are contending for victory, they avow the intention of enjoying the fruits of it. If they are defeated, they expect to retire from office. If they are successful, they claim, as a matter of right, the advantages of success. They see nothing wrong in the rule that to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy." Although the opposition party protested strongly against the "rule," they followed it when their turn came. Jackson set a fashion which was followed by his successors. For more than forty years every change in the party control of the national government was made the occasion of a political mas-

¹ *Commentaries*, book III, chapter XXXVII.

² During his first month of service in that body. He took his seat in December, 1831, and resigned to become governor of New York in July, 1832.

sacre. Possibly there was a better excuse for it when Lincoln became President than on some former occasions, since there was real reason to doubt the loyalty of officers, high and low, in the North as well as in the South. But the rule that offices were a legitimate perquisite not merely of the party in power but of the particular persons who happened to be in the exercise of power as well, engrafted itself upon the simpler rule, and was carried out in a relentless manner during the administration of General Grant. It was not enough that one holding an office should be a loyal, even an active, member of the Republican party. He must also be *persona grata* to the President, or to the senator to whose share that particular piece of patronage fell. No more scandalous chapter of political history can be cited than that which covers the story of the New York custom-house in Grant's time.

The Jackson régime ended when Harrison and Tyler were installed. Polk turned out all the Whigs who had survived until his time. Taylor and Fillmore gave the Whigs a four years' taste of office, but they all went out under Pierce. Lincoln made a clean sweep of the Democrats,¹ — and then came Johnson.

His breach with the party that elected him was gradual, but by the autumn of 1866 it was complete, and he began to wreak vengeance upon those who were opposing him in Congress by turning out of office those whom they had recommended, and filling their places with supporters of his "policy," who, of course, were Democrats. The removals — there were said to be 1283 postmasters and a corresponding number of officers of other departments, in the list — were made during the recess of the Senate, for Congress adjourned on July 28, and did not meet again until December. But when the second session of the Thirty-ninth Congress began there was immediate action to limit the President's power in this as in other directions. The Tenure of Office Act was passed, was vetoed, and was passed again notwithstanding the objections of the President, on the last day of the session — March 2, 1867. It was a comprehensive measure. It enacted that persons holding office by and with the advice and consent of the Senate were entitled to hold such office until their successors should be

¹ During that period, when the spoils system prevailed without dispute, 917 removals were made by two successive collectors of the port of New York. The average number of employés in the custom-house was less than 700.

duly appointed in like manner, and qualified; that the members of the Cabinet should hold their respective offices during the term of the President by whom they may have been appointed, and for one month thereafter, subject to removal by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; that, during a recess of the Senate, for specified reasons, the President might suspend officers and designate persons to hold their places temporarily, but he was required to report such suspensions to the Senate, and if the Senate did not concur, the suspended officer resumed his office; that when the President, in pursuance of his constitutional power, filled vacancies which might happen — not those caused by removal — during a recess of the Senate, if no appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate should be made during the ensuing session, the office was to remain in abeyance until an appointment should be made by the constitutional method. It was declared to be a high misdemeanor to accept or exercise the duties of an office in violation of the provisions of the act, punishable by a heavy fine or by imprisonment.

The bill was introduced by Thaddeus Stevens, but in its final form was quite different from the original text. In the long debates which took place in both houses of Congress, the point most discussed was the application of the principle of the bill to cabinet officers, though the general constitutional question was considered in academical arguments. It was contended by the more conservative Republicans that the President should have a free hand so far as the heads of the executive departments were concerned. But although the Senate struck out the clause relating to the secretaries, it was restored by the Committee of Conference. The bill was passed by both branches by votes of about three to one. It was vetoed by President Johnson, and passed over his veto by a majority even greater than that on accepting the report of the conference committee. This was the only instance in the constitutional history of the country when the veto power was invoked for what — as will be seen — Mr. Gerry and Hamilton himself regarded as the chief object of granting the President a “revisionary” power, namely, to enable him to resist encroachments on his constitutional authority.

Inasmuch as Congress held the purse, and could discontinue the salary attached to any office which the President might attempt to fill in violation of the provisions of the act, he was

forced to comply with it, — though his action in the matter of the removal of Secretary Stanton disregarded it.

The debates in the two houses of Congress over the measure make it plain that many members were dragged into the support of it against their better judgment. There were few — were there any? — members who repudiated the theory that the spoils belonged to the victors. The law which they were asked to pass would stand in the way of the next President whom the Republicans were sure to elect. But aside from that sordid argument, many of the members felt that it was a rather mean revenge which was planned for a political enemy. Some of them showed their reluctance to vote for it, but none except the "Johnson Republicans" gave their votes in the negative. Mr. Blaine, who voted for the bill, says in his "Twenty Years of Congress" that "the history of its operation, and of its subsequent modification, which amounted to repeal, is one to which the Republican party cannot recur with any sense of pride or satisfaction."¹ Even before the close of Johnson's administration a movement began to repeal the Tenure of Office Act. The occasion for the measure was about to be a thing of the past. General Grant was soon to succeed the President who had made himself and his acts obnoxious to the party in power. In January, 1869, the House of Representatives, with no debate, passed a bill to repeal the law. The Senate was not willing to concur. The law of 1867 gave that body a power over removals which it was reluctant to relinquish. A committee reported a substitute for the repealing bill, which did little more than exempt cabinet ministers from the operation of the act. Nothing more was done at that session, but at the extraordinary session which began simultaneously with General Grant's term, the modification of the law which found favor with the Senate was reluctantly accepted by the House of Representatives which had, a second time, by a majority of five or six to one, voted for repeal. In that form the law stood until — during the first administration of President Cleveland, March 2, 1887 — the sections of the Revised Statutes covering the whole subject of removals from office were repealed, and by omission of all legislation on the point, the system which prevailed from Washington to Johnson was restored.

But during the period following the Civil War the public conscience was awakened to the great evils and the political

¹ Vol. II, p. 274.

demoralization that attended the treatment of office as a reward of party activity. Only those who are familiar with political conditions prior to that time can be aware of the universal indifference to the scandal, not merely of the active politicians but of the people at large as well. In fact, the spoils system was taken as a matter of course by all, and was vigorously applied by those even who might be classed as statesmen. The early reformers were regarded as idealists, too good for this wicked world, and they made slow progress. Indeed, so strongly rooted in the minds of politicians was the spoils doctrine, that opposition to the reform has not yet ceased. In some recent cases of the organization of new departments or bureaus, "deserving" politicians have been admitted to the classified service by a back door, without competitive examination.

Fortunately the Presidents have been, on the whole, upholders of a better, the merit system. Congress passed an act in 1871 which authorized the President to cause the proper means to be taken to ascertain the fitness of candidates for office. Under that act President Grant appointed a commission which instituted competitive examinations in the departments at Washington; but after two years Congress refused to make further appropriations to enable the commission to continue its work, although the President praised the work already done and informed Congress that "it would be a source of mortification to himself" if the appropriation should be withheld. The President thereupon, in 1875, suspended the rules, and the reform came to an end for the time being. But the reformers persisted, and after nearly eight years more of agitation succeeded in persuading Congress to pass the act of January 16, 1883, which President Arthur promptly approved. Under that law a classified service was established, in a small way at first, and covering only a comparatively few of the clerical officers in the executive departments and in large post-offices. The list has been increased by every President since that time and now includes almost the whole civil service. The important exception is the offices that are still filled by appointment by the President with the concurrence of the Senate.

Thus the presidential office has developed in two opposite directions. From the policy of abstention from removals under the Presidents from Washington to the second Adams, it turned to the system of wholesale proscription under Jackson, and to that system it adhered until the reform which began

under Grant was continued and extended by every President to the present time. Not that there have not been many violations of the spirit of the reform. "Turn the rascals out" has been a party motto when there has been a change of administration, the "rascals" of course being all officers who supported the defeated party. Clerks and others appointed under the competitive system were secure, but consuls, collectors, postmasters, chief clerks, and others of that class were subject to removal, and in many cases were removed. To cite but one example, purely by way of example, and not to be invidious, the ravages wrought in the consular service under President Cleveland were inexcusable. But, as has been said, one President after another has cut out class after class of officers who have been appointed as reward for party service, and brought them under the rules of the reformed civil service, and has thus diminished the number of those whom it will ever be worth while to displace in order to provide a position and a salary for some one more agreeable than the incumbent to the existing administration.

One clause of the Constitution which has not heretofore been mentioned was much discussed in 1904 in connection with certain "recess" appointments made by President Roosevelt. The clause reads:—

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

The President, in January, 1903, nominated William D. Crum, a colored man, to be collector of the port of Charleston, South Carolina. An adverse report upon the nomination was made by the Senate Committee on Finance, but no action was taken on the report, and the session, and the Fifty-seventh Congress, came to an end on the 4th of March. The Senate met in special session on the same day, and the President again sent in the name of Mr. Crum. Again the Senate adjourned without action on the nomination. On the 20th of March the President, "during the recess of the Senate" issued a commission to Mr. Crum. Congress met in extraordinary session in November, 1903, and the nomination was sent in a third time. Again no action was taken. The extraordinary session of Congress ended at noon on December 2, and at the same time, without any intermission, the regular session of the Senate be-

gan. It appeared from an official letter from the Secretary of the Treasury that "precisely at twelve o'clock" on that day the President issued a new commission to Mr. Crum. At the same time he issued fresh commissions to one hundred and sixty-eight officers of the army. All those officers held recess appointments, and had been nominated to the Senate, and the Senate had not acted on them. The list of military officers was headed by the name of Brigadier-General Wood, nominated to be major-general, and all the other promotions were dependent upon that. His promotion was the only one to which there was opposition. The theory upon which the new commissions were issued was that between the end of the extraordinary session and the beginning of the regular session there was a "constructive" recess.

There were two constitutional questions involved in this case, although one of them was discussed but little on that occasion. For it seems to have been tacitly agreed, long ago, that the word "happen" in the clause quoted above is to be interpreted to signify *happen to be existing*. That is to say, a vacancy actually occurring in November, before Congress meets, may be filled by the President in the following July if the Senate has not confirmed any appointee. A contrary view was taken in an able report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in 1863, during Mr. Lincoln's presidency, and the Tenure of Office Act expressly provided that if the Senate did not confirm an appointment the office should remain in abeyance until it should be filled by an appointment to which the Senate consented. But the usual practice before the Civil War, and after the repeal of the Tenure of Office Act, was to permit the President to fill any office in which a vacancy existed, — no matter when it first "happened," — when the Senate was not in session.

But President Roosevelt's action raised a new problem, and gave rise to much hair-splitting argument. No one, on either side of the Senate, openly maintained that there was anything in the idea of a constructive recess, but some of the senators held that as the two sessions merged into each other the original recess appointments held until the adjournment of the Senate at the close of the regular session. Even that construction was a virtual condemnation of the reissue of commissions and the renewal of the nominations. It was brought out in the Senate debate by Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, who took

the lead in opposing the new gloss on the Constitution, that in 1867 the Senate refused to close the final session of the Thirty-ninth Congress at half-past eleven o'clock on March 4, because that would leave a recess of half an hour before the meeting of the Fortieth Congress, in which time President Johnson, whom Senator Sumner characterized as "a bad man," might work mischief by recess appointments. At the close of the Senate debate in 1904 the resolution offered by Mr. Tillman was adopted. It directed the Committee on the Judiciary to report "what constitutes a 'recess of the Senate,' and what are the powers and limitations of the Executive in making appointments in such cases." The committee did not report, and the whole subject was dropped, probably with the idea that the publicity given to the matter and the unanimity of the Senate on the question, would be sufficient to render unlikely similar action by any future President.

The extension of the use of the veto power is the second large development of the presidential office. There is no doubt that the intention of the framers of the Constitution would not have sanctioned the present interpretation of the clause granting the power. There is equally, of course, no doubt that the intention of the fathers cannot and ought not to control, to the prevention of anything that circumstances render necessary, and that Congress and the people sanction by their acquiescence. More especially is that true if the change is clearly admissible under the language of the Constitution.

The provision which gives the President a qualified veto upon legislation was discussed many times in the Convention. The votes upon it were far more consistent than those upon many other features of the Constitution. In fact, the Convention hardly wavered at any time from the decision that the power should reside in the President alone, and that his veto should be overruled by a two-thirds vote of each branch of the legislature. But several other propositions were made and urged with earnestness: that the veto should be absolute; that it should require a three-fourths vote to pass bills over the veto; that a council of revision, with a negative power, should be formed to consider bills; and that some of the judges should be joined with the President to exercise the power. The last-mentioned modification was that which was most frequently brought forward, most persistently pressed, and supported by the strong-

est authority. Mr. Madison favored it and spoke many times in its support. Mr. Gouverneur Morris and Mr. Ellsworth were on the same side. It is in connection with this proposition that we get the most light as to the motives of the members of the Convention in providing a veto on congressional legislation. Almost the sole object seems to have been to prevent encroachment by the legislative department upon the Executive and the Judiciary. That fact explains Mr. Madison's repeated efforts to have judges associated with the President. Mr. Gerry, who opposed the participation of judges in the veto power, said that "the object, he conceived, of the revisionary power was merely to secure the Executive Department against legislative encroachment. The Executive, therefore, who will best know and be ready to defend his rights, ought alone to have the defence of them." Mr. Morris—in the same debate¹—"concurred in thinking the public liberty in greater danger from legislative usurpation than from any other source." Colonel Mason, and he alone, suggested "that the defence of the Executive was not the sole object of the revisionary power. He expected even greater advantages from it. Notwithstanding the precautions taken in the constitution of the Legislature, it would still so much resemble that of the individual States, that it must be expected frequently to pass unjust and pernicious laws. This restraining power was therefore essentially necessary. It would have the effect not only of hindering the final passage of such laws, but would discourage demagogues from attempting to get them passed."

Hamilton in the "Federalist"² takes precisely the view of Colonel Mason. In one place he refers to "the case for which it is chiefly designed, that of an immediate attack upon the constitutional rights of the Executive," and in another to "the propensity of the Legislative department to intrude upon the rights and to absorb the powers of the other departments," but he also says:—

The power in question has a further use. It not only serves as a shield to the Executive, but it furnishes an additional security against the enactment of improper laws. It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of any impulse unfriendly to the public good, which may happen to influence a majority of that body.

¹ July 21, 1787.

² No. LXXIII.

He thought that "the negative would generally be employed with great caution," and maintained "that there would be greater danger of his not using the power when necessary than of his using it too often or too much."

Such was the commonly accepted theory of the veto power when the Constitution went into operation. The President was armed with a power to resist encroachment on his constitutional rights, and that power might also be employed to defeat bad laws. The early Presidents — in fact, no President before Andrew Johnson — were not forced to use it to resist encroachments upon the constitutional rights of the Executive. They interpreted the phrase "bad laws" to mean only unconstitutional measures, and measures obviously objectionable because passed without due consideration. Washington vetoed only two bills during his eight years of service. The first of them was an apportionment bill based on the first census. He was urged to disapprove the bill not only because it was — in the view of Jefferson, but not in that of Hamilton — violative of the Constitution, but in order to assert a power which the people might come to believe was never to be exercised. The other bill was hastily drawn and self-contradictory in one clause. Neither John Adams nor Jefferson vetoed any bill. Madison sent in six vetoes in eight years, — four on the ground of unconstitutionality, or because — among other reasons — it "introduces an unsuitable relation of members of the Judiciary Department to a discretionary authority of the Executive Department" — virtually a constitutional objection; and the sixth because of a defect in drafting. Monroe, in eight years, vetoed one bill only, — an "internal improvements" bill, — and that on the ground that it was unconstitutional. John Quincy Adams, although dealing with a Congress politically hostile to him, did not once exercise the power.

Andrew Jackson vetoed nine bills. Six of them were objected to as being repugnant to the Constitution. The others did not commend themselves to him as being wise. He was thus the first to treat the constitutional power of veto as one which authorized the President to interpose his judgment on a question of public policy to defeat a congressional enactment. No doubt he had ample warrant in the text of the Constitution and in the opinions of its original interpreters for holding that he possessed authority so to do. Jackson was also the first to employ the "pocket" veto, but he did not employ it

in the same way as became habitual with later Presidents. In 1812 Madison returned to Congress a bill which was submitted to him too late in the previous session to be returned with his objections. That, therefore, was the first approach to a "pocket" veto. Jackson, in like manner, sent a message to the Senate, in 1833, giving the reasons why he had not approved a bill submitted to him just before the close of the previous session. The next year he incorporated in his annual message his reasons for not approving another bill which reached him too late for his consideration. Still later, he prepared a message giving his objections to another bill, submitted under similar circumstances; but that message he never sent to Congress, but filed it with the Secretary of State. In none of these cases was there anything irregular, or anything to which even a violent partisan could take exception. It is not the duty of a President to sign a bill to which he has objections, if Congress has not given him the full time for consideration allowed by the Constitution. If the bill fails it is the fault of Congress. In these early cases the President made public, and in every instance except the last mentioned he sent to Congress, his reasons for disapproval. That formality is not observed in the modern practice of the pocket veto. The President does not sign the bill; he does not give reasons for withholding his approval. He had no opportunity to do so before adjournment. Whether the spirit of the Constitution would be better observed if he were to communicate his objections to Congress at the ensuing session, is a fair question for argument. But the practice, acquiesced in for many years, has taken the question out of the realm of practical politics.

Van Buren's only veto was a pocket veto of a harmless resolution which was submitted to him after the final adjournment of Congress, and which was not attested as required by the Constitution. Even Tyler, having to consider the legislation of a Congress angrily hostile to him, vetoed but eight bills — two of them pocket vetoes like those of Jackson. That is to say the bills were returned to Congress with objections at the session following that when they were passed. To be sure the vetoes by Tyler were most important, dealing as they did with the tariff, the custody of the public revenues, and such matters. Five of his vetoes were based on constitutional objections. The record of his successors up to the outbreak of the Civil War was as follows: Polk vetoed three bills, two of

them for constitutional reasons; Fillmore, none; Pierce ten, eight for constitutional reasons;¹ Buchanan seven, four for constitutional reasons. There is no record of any "pocket" vetoes, in the sense that the President left a bill unsigned and said nothing about it. In two instances, declining to sign he filed his reasons with the Secretary of State; in the other cases he sent the bill back with his objections at the beginning of the next session.

A summary of the use of the power in the seventy-two years from Washington to Lincoln shows a total of forty-seven vetoes, of which thirty-one were based on the opinion of the President that the proposed measure was unconstitutional. About one half of the others were on unimportant matters, involving no principle, and the objection was rather to the form than to the substance of the bill or resolution returned for reconsideration. But the Presidents, on occasion, did not hesitate to take the ground that they were entitled to make their judgment as to the expediency of a measure a valid "objection" under the terms of the Constitution. Tyler claimed that right, in his message of September 9, 1841, vetoing the "Fiscal corporation" bill. Pierce, in his veto of the French Spoliation Claims bill, in February, 1855, entered into an argument on the subject: —

While the Constitution thus confers on the legislative bodies the complete power of legislation in all cases, it proceeds, in the spirit of justice, to provide for the protection of the responsibility of the President. It does not compel him to affix the signature of approval to any bill unless it actually have his approbation; for while it requires him to sign if he approve, it, in my judgment, imposes upon him the duty of withholding his signature if he do not approve. In the execution of his official duty in this respect he is not to perform a merely mechanical part, but is to decide and act according to conscientious convictions of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of the proposed law. In a matter as to which he is doubtful in his own mind he may well defer to the majority of the two Houses. . . . When, however, he entertains a decisive and fixed conclusion, not merely of the unconstitutionality, but of the impropriety, or injustice in other respects of any measure, if he declares that he approves it he is false to his oath, and he deliberately disregards his constitutional obligation.

¹ The most of Polk's and Pierce's vetoes were aimed at bills which violated the Democratic doctrine that the Constitution gave no power to use the public money for purposes of "internal improvement."

Enough has been said to show that for more than seventy years the Presidents acted upon the principles laid down in the *Federalist* that the veto power was to be employed rarely and with caution; that it was granted chiefly for the defence of the Constitution against encroachment; but that it might also be exercised to prevent the enactment of bad laws, and of laws inspired by partisanship.

Lincoln vetoed two bills — one because he had already signed one accomplishing the same purpose — and one joint resolution — a “pocket” veto — because, in correcting an error in legislation it left other errors in the same act uncorrected. The advent of Mr. Johnson marked the beginning of a new era. He, and all Presidents since his time, interpreted the clause giving the veto power far more liberally than any of their predecessors. They have offset their own judgment against that of Congress not merely on great questions involving the public welfare, and on disputed constitutional questions, but on trivial matters whereon their means of information are not greater or better than those at the command of Congress, and whereon their individual judgment does not appear to be superior to that of the average congressman or senator. Two examples, among a great number that might be cited, will suffice. President Harrison, in 1890, returned a bill authorizing the city of Ogden, Utah — Utah was then a Territory — to increase its municipal debt. He thought the measure was “unwise,” and perhaps it was. But is it the duty of a President to busy himself with such trumpery matters? President Cleveland once vetoed a resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of a certain map of the United States, on the ground that a better map would soon be available. The intimate participation of the Presidents in legislation in recent times is seen in the following record: President Johnson vetoed 22 bills; President Grant, 47; President Hayes, 11; President Arthur, 4; President Cleveland, 346,¹ beside 12 pocket vetoes; President Harrison, 17; President McKinley, 5; President Roosevelt, 40. It will be observed that Mr. Cleveland in his first term vetoed more than six times as many bills as were returned by all the Presidents from 1789 to 1865, — seventy-six years.

The foregoing review of the history of the veto power indicates that there has been a distinct change in the theory and practice of Presidents. As at present understood it is much

¹ 305 in his first term, — most of them pension bills.

more than a weapon put in the hands of the Executive to defend himself against legislative encroachment ; much more than a revisory power to prevent violations of the Constitution ; much more than a security against laws due to " faction, precipitancy, or any impulse unfriendly to the public good." It has become a general revisory power, which is applied to all the legislation of Congress, whether important or not, whether concerning public laws or private and personal interests. Some Presidents use the power more frequently and upon more trivial matters than others, but they all use it to the fullest extent, and upon any matter whatsoever, when so minded.

The question has been frequently discussed whether the veto of the President is a legislative power. Von Holst says it is not, because the Constitution declares that "all legislative power herein granted is vested" in Congress. That seems a little like begging the question. At any rate it assumes that an inconsistency in the Constitution is impossible and unthinkable. Is it not reasonable to hold that the veto power as Hamilton understood it, and as all the Presidents, not even excepting Jackson, understood it until after the Civil War, was not a legislative power ; but as understood and practised to-day it does make the President in effect a third member of the legislative body ?

That question can best be considered in connection with the extension of the President's exercise of power in the third general direction. The Constitution, in its general enumeration of the functions which it assigns to the President, provides : —

He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

There was not one word of debate on this clause at any time in the Convention of 1787. The Federalist makes no comment whatever upon it. Kent merely quotes the clause, without remark. Story, although he enlarges on the subject, uses colorless language : —

The first part, relative to the President's giving information and recommending measures to Congress, is so consonant with the structure of the executive departments of the colonial and State governments, with the usage and practice of other free governments, with the general convenience of Congress, and with a due

share of responsibility on the part of the executive, that it may well be presumed to be above all real objection. From the nature and duties of the executive department he must possess more extensive sources of information, as well in regard to domestic as foreign affairs, than can belong to Congress. The true working of the laws; the defects in the nature or arrangements of the general systems of trade, finance, and justice; and the military, naval, and civil establishments of the Union, are more readily seen and more constantly under the view of the executive than they can possibly be of any other department. There is great wisdom, therefore, in not merely allowing, but in requiring the President to lay before Congress all facts and information which may assist their deliberations; and in enabling him at once to point out the evil and to suggest the remedy. He is thus justly made responsible not merely for a due administration of the existing systems, but for due diligence and examination into the means for improving them.

It is not intended, in a discussion of the extension of the President's power under this clause, any more than in a consideration of the power of removal from office, and of the veto power, to suggest that any President has gone a step further than is permissible under a strict literal interpretation of the Constitution; but rather to signalize the extension that has taken place, and to note its effect upon the system of government. As in the other two cases the change has been gradual and has not been seriously opposed by Congress. The enlargement of the President's power has, in each case, been at the expense of Congress. It was an "encroachment," in the sense that it was not what the framers of the Constitution intended when they defined the limits of the three departments; and yet, as being strictly permissible under the language of the Constitution, it could not have been successfully resisted by Congress.

As in the former cases we should naturally begin by detailing the practice of the earliest Presidents. But in order so to illustrate fully the change that has taken place it would be necessary to make copious extracts from the messages of those Presidents. Suffice it here to say that they put the simplest and most natural interpretation on the power conferred on them. They gave information of the state of the Union and recommended measures — which they understood to be subjects — for the consideration of Congress. One paragraph from a message of James Madison will indicate what is meant.

A revision of the militia laws for the purpose of rendering them more systematic and better adapting them to emergencies of the war, is at this time particularly desirable.

It must be left to those who are sufficiently interested in the evolution of our government, to study comparatively the tone and general character of the recommendations by the Presidents in the first fifty years of our national history, and in the last twenty years. In the earlier messages the attention of Congress was called to certain defects in existing laws, or to the need of new laws on other subjects, and it was left to the wisdom of Congress to frame enactments on those and other points. The modern system is to discuss the defects or the requirements in great detail, to argue upon the necessary remedy, including safeguards and exceptions, and virtually to insist that the case shall be met in a way precisely indicated, — if not, that a veto will be launched at the bill agreed upon by Congress.

The practice of recommending to Congress measures in a definite form — complete schemes of legislation which must be passed as indicated by the executive or not passed at all, save as may be agreed upon between the executive and the legislative departments in minor details, which may be the subject of compromise — that practice is supplemented by another. The President now feels it to be his privilege, nay, his duty, to bring pressure to bear upon Congress, that is to say upon certain congressmen. He invites them to call upon him to discuss the terms of the bills which he has recommended. He indicates to them what is and what is not admissible. Certain senators and representatives are recognized in the two Houses as spokesmen for the President. Others, men of the President's political party, who oppose a presidential measure as a whole, or certain features of it, are invited to the White House, and listen to the President's reasons for urging his policy. The President is the sole dispenser of public offices. Long custom has made it a rule that senators and members of the ruling party shall be consulted, shall even be permitted, to suggest the names of proper persons, when officers are to be appointed in their State or district. There is not the least evidence that any President ever intimated even vaguely that the privilege of designating officers would be withdrawn or curtailed in the case of any senator or representative who might oppose the President on any matter on which he had

set his heart. Nor, without evidence, is there any reason to suspect that any President ever did so. But that does not signify that the fear of losing "patronage" plays no part in the campaign which modern Presidents carry on to promote the success of their policies. Politicians in office are not the boldest of men. A senator taking his seat for the first time is not above shaping his course with a view to his election again six years later. It is not necessary to threaten a man with the loss of patronage if he is so constructed as to fear that he will lose it if he sets his will against that of the President.

The executive has still another weapon. He has the power to summon Congress in extraordinary session. He can say — of course privately and unofficially — that unless Congress shall pass this bill or that, he will call the two Houses to meet again. Whether this weapon has ever been used or not cannot be asserted with confidence. It has been reported, with how much or how little truth is unknown. But the use of it is possible. It has been employed more than once by another executive — the governor of New York.

Indeed it would not be difficult to sustain the proposition that the extension of executive power and influence which we are here considering, was imported into Washington by those who had filled the executive chair at Albany. The country saw little or none of it before the time of Mr. Cleveland, and it did not see very much of it then. Mr. Cleveland carried with him to the chief place in the national government the New York governor's idea of the veto power and of the proper use of it. Instances might be cited, if it was worth while, of his interposition to an unusual extent — which signifies neither an unconstitutional nor even an improper extent — to secure the enactment of legislation which he desired. And the readiness of senators and members to heed the wishes of a President even when doing so involves political inconsistency, can be seen in the votes of avowed free silver men on the bill to repeal the Silver-Purchase act, in 1893. What Mr. Cleveland did occasionally, Mr. Roosevelt did frequently, almost constantly. Congress, the men of his own party, were not in favor of many of the measures he wished to be passed. It is not too much to say that he extorted their consent to many of them, and endeavored persistently but in vain to obtain their consent to the rest. He sent an unprecedented number of special messages in advocacy of his policies, many of them covering each but a sin-

gle subject, in which the nature and form of the legislation desired were elaborated as systematically and with as much detail as would be employed by a senator in a three-day speech. He urged members individually and in groups, who were invited to meet him in his office at the White House, to support those measures. He gave to the press statements of his position on pending legislation.

The presidential pressure of which the foregoing measures are examples has been continued and even extended by his successors. Mr. Taft encountered much opposition to his legislative programme; but although possessing a personality much less pugnacious and strong-willed than Mr. Roosevelt, he was able to get from an unwilling or a half-willing Congress the most of the measures on that programme. Was it not the first occurrence of the kind when Mr. Aldrich announced to the Senate, — as though the statement were an argument in favor of the pending measure, — “This is the President’s bill”? And surely the pressure has never been greater or more openly exerted than it has been during the administration now (1916) in power. No closer attention was given to certain important items in the tariff act of 1913 at either end of the Capitol than in the White House. Mr. Wilson did not intend that Congress should send to him — as was sent to Mr. Cleveland — a tariff bill which he might regard as a betrayal of the principles of his party. What should be done about the duty, or no duty, on wool and sugar was not simply agreed upon between the President and the congressional leaders in conference; it was dictated by the President. Let us remember, too, — neither in approval nor in criticism of the President’s views, — his almost dictatorial insistence upon the passage of the ship-purchase bill and the Philippines bill.

Does such use of the office constitute the President a third branch of the legislative department? That question is not to be answered by saying that the early Presidents recommended measures to Congress and vetoed objectionable bills passed by Congress, yet that they certainly did not constitute themselves a coördinate branch of the legislative department, and in fact were not; and that Presidents now only do more frequently, more in detail, and more by the use of personal force and official position, as they did. Each branch of the legislature — in this case Congress — originates measures, considers them clause by clause as to their specific provisions, and passes

or rejects them. When the two branches do not agree upon details the matter is decided by a committee of conference. In a very real sense a President who presses upon Congress measures in which he is interested, in the manner of recent Presidents, exercises every power in legislation which is conferred by the Constitution on the two Houses of Congress. He originates measures and gives them definite form. It is true they can go no further unless one or the other House of Congress takes them up. But neither does a bill introduced in the Senate or the House of Representatives, and passed by that body, get further unless the other branch agrees to it. The White House meetings for the discussion of specific provisions and amendments correspond to the committees of conference; and finally the President, by his approval or veto, takes action which is identical with the passage or rejection of a bill by one of the Houses of Congress. If it be said that the President does not interpose in all cases, with respect to all the measures acted upon by Congress, before both branches have agreed and have sent the bill to him for his approval, it may be replied on the other hand that hundreds of House bills are passed by the Senate, and hundreds of Senate bills are passed by the House of Representatives, in the same perfunctory way that the President affixes his signature to them after both branches have passed them. As a matter of fact, since the veto power has been regarded as a power to be employed whenever the President's judgment of the wisdom or the expediency of a measure contravenes that of Congress — this in connection with his intimate participation in the origination and definite construction of measures, and also with his public and personal activity in the promotion of those measures — the President is a potent factor in legislation, and in effect, though not nominally, as really a branch of the legislative department as either House of Congress.

That is the chief development of the presidential office. It has taken place without opposition, one may even say without observation. Opposition, indeed, would have been in vain, for there is no suggestion here that any violation of the language of the Constitution has been committed in anything that the recent Presidents have done. Whether there has been a violation of the spirit of the Constitution is another matter; and on that point the present author goes no further than to say that the framers of the Constitution seem not to have anticipated

the development of the office which we have witnessed, and that the Presidents for nearly a hundred years made no movement toward such an expansion of their office.

The justification for the change, if it is to be justified, lies in the contention that in modern times the executive of the State or the nation is placed, in popular estimation, and by the popular will, in the position of a leader. He is expected to do things, and to get things done. Our legislatures and Congress are leaderless, in the sense that there are no leaders possessing authority, no leaders whom the rank and file of the party follow. The party system is by no means the perfect machine it is in most countries having a parliamentary government. Just as we were beginning to develop a system whereby the Speaker was the party leader in the House of Representatives, and leadership in the Senate was in the hands of the veterans who constituted a "steering committee," there was a revolt against both. The power of the Speaker was annulled; and first insurgency and then the defeat or death of the Senate veterans abolished leadership altogether and introduced in its stead the tyranny of the caucus.

That is not precisely the argument that has been offered to justify the assumption of leadership by the executive. Nor has any President deemed it necessary or worth while to justify it, or even to intimate that he regarded himself as a leader. But it would be idle to deny that modern democracies no less than those of the ancient world crave leaders. There is no explanation of the springing up and growth of the "boss" system, or of the power which self-chosen bosses exert in politics, which does not rest in the last analysis on the willingness, even the eagerness of the multitude to follow strong men, and to seek for a new leader though he may not be a strong man, when the old leader dies or retires.

The principle upon which the assumption of leadership by an elected executive in a republican state, founded on a separation of the three departments of government, was explained and advocated by the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, later a justice of the Supreme Court and now (1916) the Republican candidate for President of the United States, in an oration delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa of Harvard College, June 30, 1910.¹ Mr. Hughes, was the Governor of New York — another governor of that State, it will be observed — and was one who had carried

¹ *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, September, 1910.

the theory of leadership by the executive further, perhaps, than any of his predecessors. For he had urged his measures upon the legislature in definite form, and when his recommendations were disregarded had called the legislature back to Albany and, strengthened by public sentiment, had practically forced the legislature to yield. His argument is here given in full:—

In considering the trend of our democracy we cannot fail to note at the present time the tendency to increase the relative importance and influence of the executive department, the difficulty of maintaining party coherence, and the larger measure of direct control exercised by the people over the instrumentalities of government.

The scope of administration has increased rapidly during the past few years, not only with respect to the multiplication of the demands traditionally associated with it, but also in the provision that has been made to secure adequate supervision of activities related to the public interest. This extension of administrative burdens and facilities would of itself enhance in public estimation the importance of the chief administrators in Nation and State.

But the aggrandizement of the Executive is not to be accounted for simply in this way. It is rather that out of the conflicts between competing interests or districts the Executive emerges as the representative of the people as a whole. Within the State, for example, each representative in the Legislature is endeavoring to obtain something for his own district in order that he may stand well at home. He naturally looks at every general question with more regard to his political fortunes than with respect to the opinion or the interest of the State as a whole. It is well, of course, that each district should have its interests well represented. But in this rivalry of purely local concerns, a proper perspective with regard to matters of general policy is often lost. The general sentiment must find a voice, and in the course of our experience the people have come to look to the Chief Executive for that voice. By his authority to recommend measures which he believes to be of general importance, and by his freedom to support his recommendations with argument and appeal, he commands a position of influence which is not embarrassed by district limitations. Having this opportunity, he is necessarily under the obligations which it imposes, and when there is a preponderant sentiment in favor of a measure or policy believed to be just, the people look to the Executive to speak in their behalf and to present that measure or policy as cogently as he may within the limits of his constitutional authority. This is the result of the natural demand for lead-

ership which the functions of the office afford. It also carries with it direct accountability to the people, and in fact is only a phase of the tendency toward a greater measure of direct popular control.

The Executive is elected as a candidate of a political party, and represents the policies of his party. He is, however, more than a party leader. The loyalty of the people, irrespective of party, toward their government, which he in its chief office so largely personifies, tends to establish a relation between the Executive and the people at large quite distinct from that which he sustains to his party. Here again there come into play the influences resulting from the extension of administration and the demand on the part of the community for proper standards of administrative conduct. There is a wide field of executive action in which partisan questions have no place. Good administration is impartial, and with respect to it the matters as to which our citizens differ are of small account compared to those as to which they agree. In the just and honorable conduct of public affairs the Executive finds the opportunity, as well as the duty, faithfully to represent the common sentiment.

But assuming that improper methods are not used, the Executive is strong in meeting the responsibilities thus assigned to him, only as he does in fact represent public opinion. As the people are entitled to look to him to lead, he is entitled to look to the people for support. Upon public opinion his leadership depends, and in fair appeal he finds the strongest instrument at his command. Thus, within his constitutional limitations, the influence of the Executive broadens and, while wholesome and beneficial results may be secured, he enjoys no arbitrary power, for he is constantly under the check of public criticism and the common sentiment, which he ignores at his peril.

The theory is easily understood, and Mr. Justice Hughes has put it clearly and cogently. But after all is it not the argument for government by a "good despot"? If despots had all been good, mankind would never have invented and established republics. Moreover there is in the passage above quoted a certain amount of unproved assumption. "The people have come to look to the Chief Executive" to represent the general sentiment? Is it not rather that the Chief Executive has been the agent in creating the idea that he is their proper leader; and is not that the way it has always been when a nation was preparing itself for a dictator?

There seems also to be an assumption which experience does

not justify in the suggestion that the Chief Executive knows by some process of intuition what is the popular sentiment and the popular desire, and that, knowing it, he will infallibly endeavor to secure the triumph of that sentiment and the fruition of that desire. Have we not had perverse governors and self-willed Presidents? History tells us that Executives have often been woefully deceived as to the wishes of their people, and that other Executives, strong in their own convictions, and confident of their own opinions, have withstood public sentiment of which they were fully conscious. Nor is it quite true that a governor or President setting himself up as a leader "is constantly under the check of public criticism and the common sentiments which he ignores at his peril." For he has been elected for a definite term, and can continue to defy public criticism, unless he is moved to follow, as well as to direct, public opinion in order to win a reelection.

It can hardly be denied that the aim of every true republican government, and of every government by a constitutional monarchy, is to avoid giving great power of leadership into the hands of one man. That is so obvious that it requires no argument and no citation of examples. If it be admitted it follows that "the aggrandizement of the Executive" is a departure from the universally accepted policy of free governments, upon the road that leads toward despotism. It is not — at all events — in accordance with the noble principle enunciated in the Constitution of Massachusetts: —

In the government of this commonwealth, the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them: to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men.

The development of the presidency into a national leadership has naturally brought about another change — a change which had a beginning before the final evolution we have been considering, but has been greatly accentuated in most recent times. Prior to the time of President Andrew Johnson it is doubtful if any President in office ever made a political harangue to a party or a miscellaneous audience. All the Presidents, from Washington onward, were accustomed to travel over the country and to make patriotic and non-partisan addresses. The sentiment that a candidate for the office, who

might soon be the President of all parties, should refrain from everything of the nature of stump speaking, was also prevalent, but in process of time was rather weakly held. Mr. Blaine, in 1884, was the first prominent candidate who made an extensive stumping tour. Since then, as has been shown in the preceding chapters, it has become the regular and ordinary practice of candidates to spend nearly all the time between nomination and election day, in touring the country, addressing great audiences in the cities, and showing themselves to throngs of admiring supporters from the rear platform of a railway car at every stopping-place. In the canvass of 1912, which is not discussed in detail there was an intensive modification of the custom, for the candidates for party nomination, including a President and an ex-President, engaged in "whirlwind" campaigns in many States, in competition for the favor of the National Conventions.

It results from the situation that has been created that a President possesses and exercises a power transcending that of any hereditary monarch of a constitutional government, at the same time that by his direct and intimate association with the people—"the common people," he may be the most democratic of sovereigns. Among all the unique creations of the American Constitution there is nothing more remarkable than the presidency as it exists in the Twentieth Century.

Has the presidency reached its ultimate development? That is a question for the future. But if we can take a lesson from history the tentative answer must be in the negative. It is the teaching of experience that power always tends to its own increase, at the expense of a weaker power. It has taken centuries for the British House of Commons to rise from its feeble beginnings to its present supremacy over King and Lords, the elder estates of the realm. But it has risen by successive steps and has never lost an advantage once gained. The history of the speakership of our own House of Representatives is a case closely in point. Originally the Speaker was merely a presiding officer without special authority of any sort. It was deemed unbecoming in him to show any partisan leaning in his action in the chair. But when a strong man was made Speaker he assumed certain powers, and the House did not resent his so doing. His successor, who might not be a strong man, claimed and exercised all the authority he inherited. So it went on until another Speaker, endowed with a capacity for leadership, and

with ambition, came to the chair. Thus the Speaker became more and more a party leader and a controlling power in the House. Henry Clay was the first to take a long step in that direction. The progress was not great but was gradual for thirty or forty years, mainly because the speakers were not generally men of great force. But consider the development of the powers of the Speaker under Colfax, Blaine, Carlisle, Reed, and Cannon. It was so great that it produced a revolution.


So it has been with the presidency. Changed but little in the first forty years, it was transformed into a potent force in the government by Jackson. None of his successors has yielded a particle of power which Jackson claimed and exercised. In the foregoing pages the successive steps have been outlined by which the Presidents have increased their power and influence in the government. In no instance has there been a surrender of anything previously gained, or a recurrence to earlier standards. President Roosevelt carried his conception of the powers and prerogatives of his office to the highest point yet reached. Since his retirement from office he has given his view of the extent of the power of the Executive in his "Notes for a Possible Autobiography," in which he takes the position that all powers not granted to any other department of the government and not denied to it, may rightfully be assumed and exercised by the President. He calls attention to his "insistence upon the theory that the executive power was limited only by specific restrictions and prohibitions appearing in the Constitution or imposed by Congress under its constitutional powers." In another form he puts it as his "belief that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws." It is a long way to that view of the President's power from the provision of the Constitution itself that all powers not delegated to the United States — and of course that includes all powers not granted to any officer of the United States — are reserved to the States and the people.

Mr. Roosevelt's successors have had no opportunity to show by their action in concrete cases, as he had in the coal strike and the Panama canal, whether they would agree with his theory. But Mr. Taft says frankly in his "Presidency" that he regards it as "unsafe doctrine." Yet although neither of the last two Presidents has been called upon to assume any powers not directly derivable from the Constitution, both of them

have not only made use, as a matter of right, of all the powers and all the methods by which President Roosevelt undertook to impose his will on the government, but have refined those methods to such an extent that by a little further advance in the same direction the constitutional initiative of Congress on important matters will disappear, and an executive initiative will take its place. That will be an introduction not of the British system, where the executive is but a committee of Parliament, but of a system not unlike that of the German Empire.

The Constitution is still adaptable to the emergencies that will arise, and there will still be masterful men at the head of affairs. Fortunately there are and will still be wise and far-seeing men who will not suffer the people to be led blindfold, and who will guard the country from permitting too large a share of the government to fall to any man — for in that direction lies the danger to American liberty.

THE END



APPENDIX

CONVENTIONS, CANDIDATES, AND PLATFORMS CANVASS OF 1916

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY CONVENTION, HELD AT
NEW YORK, APRIL 23

Candidates

For President, Arthur Reimer, of Massachusetts.

For Vice-President, Caleb Harrison, of Illinois.

Platform

THE Socialist Labor Party, in national convention assembled, reaffirming its previous platform declarations, reasserts the right of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We hold that the purpose of government is to secure to every citizen the enjoyment of this right; but taught by experience we hold furthermore that such right is illusory to the majority of the people, to wit, the working class, under the present system of economic inequality that is essentially destructive of their life, their liberty, and their happiness.

We hold that the true theory of economics is that the means of production must be owned, operated, and controlled by the people in common. Man cannot exercise his right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness without the ownership of the land on, and the tool with which to work. Deprived of these, his life, his liberty, and his fate fall into the hands of that class which owns these essentials for work and production.

We hold that the existing contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation — the latter resulting from the private ownership of the natural and social opportunities — divides the people into two classes: the Capitalist Class and the Working Class; throws society into the convulsions of the Class Struggle; and perverts government in the interests of the Capitalist Class.

Thus Labor is robbed of the wealth it alone produces, is denied the means of self-employment, and by compulsory idleness in wage-slavery, is even deprived of the necessities of life.

Against such a system the Socialist Labor Party raises the ban-

ner of revolt, and demands the unconditional surrender of the Capitalist Class.

In place of such a system the Socialist Labor Party aims to substitute a system of social ownership of the means of production, industrially administered by the Working Class — the workers to assume control and direction as well as operation of their industrial affairs.

This solution of necessity requires the organization of the Working Class as a class upon revolutionary political and industrial lines.

We therefore call upon the wage workers to organize themselves into a revolutionary political organization under the banner of the Socialist Labor Party; and to organize themselves likewise upon the industrial field into a revolutionary industrial union in keeping with their political aims.

And we also call upon all other intelligent citizens to place themselves squarely upon the ground of Working Class interests, and join us in this mighty and noble work of human emancipation, so that we may put summary end to the existing barbarous class conflict by placing the land and all the means of production, transportation, and distribution into the hands of the people as a collective body, and substituting the Coöperative Commonwealth for the present state of planless production, industrial war, and social disorder — a commonwealth in which every worker shall have the free exercise and full benefit of his faculties, multiplied by all the factors of modern civilization.

REPUBLICAN PARTY CONVENTION, HELD AT CHICAGO, JUNE 7

Candidates

For President, Charles Evans Hughes, of New York.

For Vice-President, Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana.

Platform

In 1861 the Republican party stood for the Union. As it stood for the Union of States, it now stands for a united people, true to American ideals, loyal to American traditions, knowing no allegiance except to the Constitution, to the Government, and to the Flag of the United States. We believe in American policies at home and abroad.

We declare that we believe in and will enforce the protection of every American citizen in all the rights secured to him by the Constitution, treaties, and the law of nations, at home and abroad,

by land and by sea. These rights, which, in violation of the specific promise of their party made at Baltimore in 1912, the Democratic President and the Democratic Congress have failed to defend, we will unflinchingly maintain.

We desire peace, the peace of justice and right, and believe in maintaining a straight and honest neutrality between the belligerents in the great war in Europe. We must perform all our duties and insist upon all our rights as neutrals without fear and without favor. We believe that peace and neutrality, as well as the dignity and influence of the United States, cannot be preserved by shift expedients, by phrase-making, by performances in language, or by attitudes ever changing in an effort to secure votes or voters. The present Administration has destroyed our influence abroad and humiliated us in our own eyes. The Republican party believes that a firm, consistent, and courageous foreign policy, always maintained by Republican Presidents in accordance with American traditions, is the best, as it is the only true, way to preserve our peace and restore us to our rightful place among the nations. We believe in the pacific settlement of international disputes and favor the establishment of a world court for that purpose.

We deeply sympathize with the fifteen million people of Mexico who, for three years have seen their country devastated, their homes destroyed, their fellow citizens murdered, and their women outraged, by armed bands of desperadoes led by self-seeking, conscienceless agitators who, when temporarily successful in any locality, have neither sought nor been able to restore order or establish and maintain peace.

We express our horror and indignation at the outrages which have been and are being perpetrated by bandits upon American men and women who were or are in Mexico by invitation of the laws and of the Government of that country, and whose rights to security of person and property are guaranteed by solemn treaty obligations. We denounce the indefensible methods of interference employed by this Administration in the internal affairs of Mexico and refer with shame to its failure to discharge the duty of this country as next friend to Mexico, its duty to other Powers, who have relied upon us as such friend, and its duty to our citizens in Mexico, in permitting the continuance of such conditions, first, by failure to act promptly and firmly, and second, by lending its influence to the continuation of such conditions through recognition of one of the factions responsible for these outrages.

We pledge our aid in restoring order and maintaining peace in Mexico. We promise to our citizens on and near our border, and to those in Mexico, wherever they may be found, adequate and absolute protection in their lives, liberty, and property.

We reaffirm our approval of the Monroe Doctrine, and declare its maintenance to be a policy of this country essential to its present and future peace and safety and to the achievement of its manifest destiny.

We favor the continuance of Republican policies, which will result in drawing more and more closely the commercial, financial, and social relations between this country and the countries of Latin America.

We renew our allegiance to the Philippine policy inaugurated by McKinley, approved by Congress, and consistently carried out by Roosevelt and Taft. Even in this short time it has enormously improved the material and social conditions of the islands, given the Philippine people a constantly increasing participation in their Government, and if persisted in will bring still greater benefits in the future.

We accepted the responsibility of the islands as a duty to civilization and the Filipino people. To leave with our task half done would break our pledges, injure our prestige among nations, and imperil what has already been accomplished.

We condemn the Democratic Administration for its attempt to abandon the Philippines, which was prevented only by the vigorous opposition of Republican members of Congress, aided by a few patriotic Democrats.

We reiterate our unqualified approval of the action taken in December, 1911, by the President and Congress to secure with Russia, as with other countries, a treaty that will recognize the absolute right of expatriation and prevent all discrimination of whatever kind between American citizens, whether native-born or alien, and regardless of race, religion, or previous political allegiance. We renew the pledge to observe this principle and to maintain the right of asylum, which is neither to be surrendered nor restricted, and we unite in the cherished hope that the war which is now desolating the world may speedily end, with a complete and lasting restoration of brotherhood among the nations of the earth and the assurance of full equal rights, civil and religious, to all men in every land.

In order to maintain our peace and make certain the security of our people within our own borders, the country must have not only adequate but thorough and complete national defence ready for any emergency. We must have a sufficient and efficient regular army, and a provision for ample reserves, already drilled and disciplined, who can be called at once to the colors when the hour of danger comes.

We must have a navy so strong and so well proportioned and equipped, so thoroughly ready and prepared, that no enemy can

gain command of the sea and effect a landing in force on either our western or our eastern coast. To secure these results we must have a coherent, continuous policy of national defence, which even in these perilous days the Democratic party has utterly failed to develop, but which we promise to give to the country.

The Republican party stands now, as always, in the fullest sense for the policy of tariff protection to American industries and American labor and does not regard an anti-dumping provision as an adequate substitute. Such protection should be reasonable in amount, but sufficient to protect adequately American industry and American labor and be so adjusted as to prevent undue exactions by monopolies or trusts. It should, moreover, give special attention to securing the industrial independence of the United States, as in the case of dye-stuffs.

Through wise tariff and industrial legislation our industries can be so organized that they will become not only a commercial bulwark but a powerful aid to national defence.

The Underwood Tariff Act is a complete failure in every respect. Under its administration imports have enormously increased in spite of the fact that the intercourse with foreign countries has been largely cut off by reason of the war, while the revenues of which we stand in such dire need have been greatly reduced. Under normal conditions which prevailed prior to the war, it was clearly demonstrated that this act deprived the American producer and the American wage-earner of that protection which entitled them to meet their foreign competitors, and but for the adventitious conditions created by the war, would long since have paralyzed all forms of American industry and deprived American labor of its just reward.

It has not in the least reduced the cost of living, which has constantly advanced from the date of its enactment. The welfare of our people demands its repeal and the substitution of a measure which in peace as well as in war will produce ample revenue and give reasonable protection to all forms of American production in mine, forest, field, and factory.

We favor the creation of a tariff commission with complete power to gather and compile information for the use of Congress in all matters relating to the tariff.

The Republican party has long believed in the rigid supervision and strict regulation of the transportation and great corporations of the country. It has put its creed into its deeds and all really effective laws regulating the railroads and the great industrial corporations are the work of Republican Congresses and Presidents. For this policy of regulation and supervision the Democrats, in a stumbling and piecemeal way, are undertaking to involve the

Government in business which should be left within the sphere of private enterprise and in direct competition with its own citizens, a policy which is sure to result in waste, great expense to the taxpayer and in an inferior product.

The Republican party firmly believes that all who violate the laws in regulation of business should be individually punished. But prosecution is very different from persecution, and business success, no matter how honestly attained, is apparently regarded by the Democratic party as in itself a crime. Such doctrines and beliefs choke enterprise and stifle prosperity. The Republican party believes in encouraging American business, as it believes in and will seek to advance all American interests.

We favor an effective system of rural credits as opposed to the ineffective law proposed by the present Democratic Administration.

We favor the extension of the rural free delivery system and condemn the Democratic Administration for curtailing and crippling it.

In view of the policies adopted by all the maritime nations to encourage their shipping interests, and in order to enable us to compete with them for the ocean-carrying trade, we favor the payment to ships engaged in the foreign trade of liberal compensation for services actually rendered in carrying the mails, and such further legislation as will build up an adequate American merchant marine and give us ships which may be requisitioned by the Government in time of national emergency.

We are utterly opposed to the Government ownership of vessels, as proposed by the Democratic party, because Government-owned ships, while effectively preventing the development of the American merchant marine by private capital, will be entirely unable to provide for the vast volume of American freights, and will leave us more helpless than ever in the hard grip of foreign syndicates.

Interstate and intrastate transportation have become so interwoven that the attempt to apply two and often several sets of laws to its regulation has produced conflicts of authority, embarrassment in operation and inconvenience and expense to the public.

The entire transportation system of the country has become essentially national. We therefore favor such action by legislation, or, if necessary, through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as will result in placing it under exclusive federal control.

The increasing cost of the National Government and the need for the greatest economy of its resources in order to meet the growing demands of the people for Government service call for the severest condemnation of the wasteful appropriations of this Democratic Administration, of its shameless raids on the Treasury, and

of its opposition to and rejection of President Taft's oft-repeated proposals and earnest efforts to secure economy and efficiency through the establishment of a simple, businesslike budget system to which we pledge our support and which we hold to be necessary to effect a real reform in the administration of national finances.

We believe in a careful husbandry of all the natural resources of the nation — a husbandry which means development without waste; use without abuse.

The Civil Service Law has always been sustained by the Republican party and we renew our repeated declaration that it shall be thoroughly and honestly enforced and extended wherever practicable. The Democratic party has created since March 4, 1913, thirty thousand offices outside of the Civil Service Law at an annual cost of forty-four million dollars to the taxpayers of the country.

We condemn the gross abuse and the misuse of the law by the present Democratic Administration and pledge ourselves to a reorganization along lines of efficiency and economy.

Reaffirming the attitude long maintained by the Republican party, we hold that officials appointed to administer the government of any territory should be *bona fide* residents of the territory in which their duties are to be performed.

We pledge the Republican party to the faithful enforcement of all federal laws passed for the protection of labor. We favor vocational education, the enactment and rigid enforcement of a federal child labor law; the enactment of a generous and comprehensive workmen's compensation law, within the commerce power of Congress, and an accident compensation law, covering all Government employees. We favor the collection and collation, under the direction of the Department of Labor, of complete data relating to industrial hazards for the information of Congress, to the end that such legislation may be adopted as may be calculated to secure the safety, conservation, and protection of labor from the dangers incident to industry and transportation.

The Republican party, reaffirming its faith in government of the people, by the people, for the people, as a measure of justice to one half the adult people of this country, favors the extension of the suffrage to women, but recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself.

Such are our principles, such are our purposes and policies. We close as we began. The times are dangerous and the future is fraught with peril. The great issues of the day have been confused by words and phrases. The American spirit, which made the country and saved the Union, has been forgotten by those charged with the responsibility of power. We appeal to all Americans,

whether naturalized or native-born, to prove to the world that we are Americans in thought and deed, with one loyalty, one hope, one aspiration. We call on all Americans to be true to the spirit of America, to the great traditions of their common country, and above all things, to keep the faith.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY CONVENTION, HELD AT CHICAGO,
JUNE 7

Candidates

For President, Theodore Roosevelt, of New York.

For Vice-President, John M. Parker, of Louisiana.

(Mr. Roosevelt declined the nomination, and the National Committee thereupon "endorsed" the nominee of the Republicans, Mr. Hughes. Mr. Parker did not decline.)

Platform

This is the year of decision for the nation's future. As we now decide, so we shall go forward in righteousness and power, or backward in degradation and weakness.

Of necessity we deal now with the foundations of our national life. We are facing elemental facts of force, of right and wrong, of extreme national peril. Our present choice of path will be irrevocable. The tradition of isolation has been ended. The United States is now part of a world-system of civilization. We stand or fall as we prepare now to take our part in peace or war and hold our own therein.

As members of an international community, we are subject to certain basic duties : —

To secure the rights and equal treatment of our citizens, native or naturalized, on land and sea, without regard to race, creed, or nativity ;

To guard the honor and uphold the just influence of our nation ;

To maintain the integrity of international law.

These are the corner-stones of civilization. We must be strong to defend them.

The present war shows that it is the supreme duty of civilization to create conditions which will make peace permanent. Our country must be able and ready to take its part in that work. The peace which we desire for our country is not the peace of submission and cowardice, but the peace of justice. War and its evils

will not be done away with by suffering injustice to ourselves or others, nor by pledging ourselves to drastic action for international right if we do not prepare the forces which would sustain such action. We can perform our rightful part in promoting permanent international peace only by a willingness and a prepared ability to defend our own rights and the rights of other nations.

We earnestly desire to keep the peace, but there are higher things which we must keep if we would keep the faith as Washington and Lincoln kept it. Peace at the price of submission and cowardice is not desirable, nor is it the peace of justice which alone would make it permanent. Supine submission to the invasion of our rights or indifference to the wrongs of weaker nations will not long maintain peace, nor will mere threat of action enforce our rights under international law. There must be an unfaltering determination and a personal ability to defend our rights and to fulfil our international obligations. In such a readiness lies the sure safeguard of both national honor and continued peace. Failure to deal firmly and promptly with the menace of Mexican disorders has brought conditions worse than warfare, and has weakened our national self-respect. Every resource of Government should forthwith be used to end those conditions, and protect from outrage the lives, honor, and property of American men and women in Mexico.

Whatever our country can legitimately do to attain peace for war-stricken Europe and to aid in the procurement of equal rights without discrimination because of race or creed to all men in all lands should be done.

Adequate provision for the common defence has become the task of foremost national concern.

Beneath the structure of military and economic strength there must be a unified spirit of this cosmopolitan people, a deep loyalty and undivided allegiance to America, the land which has welcomed us and our immigrant forefathers. Back of any adequate national preparedness in arms or in industry must remain the democratic soul of an undivided people, determined to keep America's great heritage and traditions unfalteringly in first place. American problems must be faced and solved, and solely in the light of American ideals. American political action must be taken in the service of American ends. Unwavering patriotism and unfaltering fidelity to America is the only spirit which should animate our citizens. If in this melting-pot of a hundred nations the children of any fail to find our common destiny worthy of common devotion and defence we shall sustain irreparable loss of national character.

In this spirit of Americanism, action must be taken for the common defence.

We must be ready, in spirit, arms, and industry. Preparation in arms requires:—

A navy restored to at least second rank in battle efficiency;

A regular army of 250,000 men, fully armed and trained, as a first line of land defence;

A system of military training adequate to organize with promptness, behind that first line of the army and navy, a citizen soldiery, supplied, armed, and controlled by the National Government.

In our democracy every male citizen is charged with the duty of defending his country. This duty is not new. It has existed from the foundation of the Government. Under modern conditions, it cannot be performed without military training; service without training means slaughter and disaster. As the nation has always recognized and exercised the right to enforce compulsory military service in time of war, so should there be universal military training for that service during times of peace.

We believe in preparedness for defence, but never for aggression. We must not sacrifice the lives of men for the glory or gain of military conquest. And we believe that the women of the country, who share with the men the burdens of Government in times of peace and make equal sacrifice in time of war, should be given the full political right of suffrage either by state or federal action.

Arms alone cannot maintain a nation. Of far greater permanent importance must stand a national industry efficient for the general welfare, a prosperity justly distributed, a national life organized in all points for national ends. Four years ago this party was born of a nation's awakened sense of these fundamental truths. In the platform then adopted we set forth our position on public questions. We here reaffirm the declarations there made on national issues.

A nation to survive must stand for the principles of social and industrial justice. We have no right to expect continued loyalty from an oppressed class. We must remove the artificial causes of the high cost of living; prevent the exploitation of men, women, and children in industry by extension of the Workmen's Compensation Law to the full limit permitted under the Constitution, and by a thoroughgoing child labor law; protect the wage-earner, and by a properly regulated system of rural credits encourage the farmer and give to the landless man opportunity to acquire land. A country must be worth living in to be worth fighting for.

To make possible social justice, to maintain our position in peace and war, we must insure business and industrial prosperity. This can be done—

By a regulation of industry aimed at promoting its growth and

prosperity, and a just distribution of its returns and a healthy expansion of foreign trade ;

By a conservation and development of our national resources for the good of all ;

By the reëstablishment of our merchant marine ;

By the development of a system of interstate national highways ;

By making a new standard of governmental efficiency through a complete civil service system, a national budget, and the destruction of "pork barrel" legislation.

By the creation of a permanent expert tariff commission, with a view of intelligently and scientifically adjusting the tariff, so as to build up, rather than destroy, American industry.

The protective system is essential to our national prosperity. Tremendous new pressures will be thrown upon our industries after the war by the highly mobilized production of Europe. At all times conditions of competition must be equalized between our own and foreign countries. We can only get the protection we need through the use of exact and complete knowledge, unaffected by prejudice or politics. We can secure that knowledge at all times and when needed only through such a commission.

The industrial issues are chiefly national. The present and certain future make it imperative that the regulation and promotion of industry, and especially of transportation and foreign trade, be national, not local. Only federal power can work justice to capital and labor throughout the nation. Only national authority can mobilize industry for defence as the nation's need demands it.

We have set forth in this platform plain essentials of national existence. They are not new in principle. Most men agree with them. Any man may propose them. The urgent and immediate need is for their performance. We have had ample experience with the promiser ; with words and the bitter taste of words retracted. We must choose a man, who, not alone by words, but by past deeds, gives guaranty that he can and will make these things good. The issue is one of men. In the midst of world-changes unparalleled in history we cannot forecast the problems which will confront our Government during the war and at its end. We therefore need as President a leader who knows the nations, a man who acts. If we continue longer to stand for words as above deeds, for fancies as above facts, we shall receive and merit the fate that surely awaits the man or people who do not face the truth.

We will meet and work with any man or party who sees the nation's need and puts forward a leader fit to meet it. We will accept no less, in plan or in the man, and we solemnly charge upon any who place partisan politics above country the responsibility for a nation's future sacrificed to self-interest and spoils.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY CONVENTION, HELD AT ST. LOUIS,
JUNE 13

Candidates

For President, Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey.

For Vice-President, Thomas R. Marshall, of Indiana.

Platform

The Democratic party in annual convention assembled adopts the following declaration, to the end that the people of the United States may both realize the achievements wrought by four years of Democratic Administration and be apprised of the policies to which the party is committed for the further conduct of national affairs.

We endorse the Administration of Woodrow Wilson. It speaks for itself. It is the best exposition of sound Democratic policy at home and abroad.

We challenge comparison of our record, our keeping of pledges, and our constructive legislation, with those of any party of any time.

We found our country hampered by special privilege, a vicious tariff, obsolete banking laws, and an inelastic currency. Our foreign affairs were dominated by commercial interests for their selfish ends. The Republican party, despite repeated pledges, was impotent to correct abuses which it had fostered. Under our Administration, under a leadership which has never faltered, these abuses have been corrected and our people have been freed therefrom.

Our archaic banking and currency system, prolific of panic and disaster under Republican administrations,—long the refuge of the money trust,—has been supplanted by the Federal Reserve Act, a true democracy of credit under Government control, already proved a financial bulwark in a world-crisis, mobilizing our resources, placing abundant credit at the disposal of legitimate industry, and making a currency panic impossible.

We have created a Federal Trade Commission to accommodate the perplexing questions arising under the anti-trust laws, so that monopoly may be strangled at its birth and legitimate industry encouraged. Fair competition in business is now assured.

We have effected an adjustment of the tariff, adequate for revenue under peace conditions, and fair to the consumer and to the producer. We have adjusted the burdens of taxation so that swollen incomes bear their equitable share. Our revenues have been sufficient in times of world stress.

We have lifted human labor from the category of commodities and have secured to the workingman the right of voluntary association for his protection and welfare. We have protected the rights of the laborer against the unwarranted issuance of writs of injunction, and have guaranteed to him the right of trial by jury in cases of alleged contempt committed outside the presence of the court.

We have advanced the parcel post to genuine efficiency, enlarged the postal savings system, added ten thousand rural delivery routes and extensions, thus reaching two and one half millions additional people, improved the postal service in every branch, and, for the first time in our history, placed the Post-Office system on a self-supporting basis, with actual surplus in 1913, 1914, and 1916.

The reforms which were most obviously needed to clear away privilege, prevent unfair discrimination, and release the energies of men of all ranks and advantages, have been effected by recent legislation. We must now remove, so far as possible, every remaining element of unrest and uncertainty from the path of the business men of America, and secure for them a continued period of quiet, assured, and confident prosperity.

We reaffirm our belief in the doctrine of a tariff for the purpose of providing sufficient revenue for the operation of the Government economically administered, and unreservedly endorse the Underwood Tariff Law as truly exemplifying that doctrine. We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's productions and trade. The events of the last two years have brought about many momentous changes. In some respects their effects are yet conjectural and wait to be disclosed, particularly in regard to our foreign trade. Two years of a war which has directly involved most of the chief industrial nations of the world, and which has indirectly affected the life and industry of all nations, are bringing about economic changes more varied and far-reaching than the world has ever before experienced. In order to ascertain just what those changes may be, the Democratic Congress is providing for a non-partisan tariff commission to make impartial and thorough study of every economic fact that may throw light either upon our past or upon our future fiscal policy, with regard to the imposition of taxes on imports, or with regard to the changing and changed conditions under which our trade is carried on. We cordially endorse this timely proposal and declare ourselves in sympathy with the principle and purpose of shaping legislation within that field in accordance with clearly established facts rather than in accordance with the demands of selfish interests, or upon information provided largely, if not exclusively, by them.

Immediate provision should be made for the development of

the carrying trade of the United States. Our foreign commerce has in the past been subject to many unnecessary and vexatious obstacles in the way of legislation of Republican Congresses. Until the recent Democratic tariff legislation it was hampered by unreasonable burdens of taxation. Until the recent banking legislation, it had at its disposal few of the necessary instrumentalities of international credit and exchange. Until the formulation of the pending act to promote the construction of a merchant marine, it lacked even the prospect of adequate carriage by sea. We heartily endorse the purposes and policy of the pending shipping bill, and favor all such additional measures of constructive or remedial legislation as may be necessary to restore our flag to the seas and to provide further facilities for our foreign commerce, particularly such laws as may be made to remove unfair conditions of competition in the dealings of American merchants and producers with competitors in foreign markets.

The part that the United States will play in the new day of international relationships which is now upon us will depend upon our preparation and our character. The Democratic party, therefore, recognizes the assertion and triumphant demonstration of the indivisibility and coherent strength of the nation as the supreme issue of this day in which the whole world faces the crisis of manifold change. It summons all men, of whatever origin or creed, who would count themselves Americans to join in making clear to all the world the unity and consequent power of America.

This is an issue of patriotism. To taint it with partisanship would be to defile it. In this day of test, America must show itself, not a nation of partisans, but a nation of patriots. There is gathered here in America the best of the blood, the industry, and the genius of the whole world, the elements of a great race and a magnificent society to be melted into a mighty and splendid nation.

Whoever, actuated by the purpose to promote the interest of a foreign power, in disregard of our own country's welfare or to injure this Government in its foreign relations or cripple or destroy its industries at home, and whoever by arousing prejudices of a racial, religious, or other nature creates discord and strife among our people so as to obstruct the wholesome process of unification, is faithless to the trust which the privileges of citizenship repose in him and disloyal to his country.

We therefore condemn as subversive of this nation's unity and integrity, and as destructive of its welfare, the activities and designs of every group or organization, political or otherwise, that has for its object the advancement of the interest of a foreign power, whether such object is promoted by intimidating the Government, a political party, or representatives of the people, or which

is calculated and tends to divide our people into antagonistic groups, and thus to destroy that complete agreement and solidarity of the people and that unity of sentiment and national purpose so essential to the perpetuity of the nation and its free institutions.

We condemn all alliances and combinations of individuals in this country, of whatever nationality or descent, who agree and conspire together for the purpose of embarrassing or weakening our Government or of improperly influencing or coercing our public representatives in dealing or negotiating with any foreign power. We charge that such conspiracies exist and have been instigated for the purpose of advancing the interests of foreign countries to the prejudice and detriment of our own country. We condemn any political party which, in view of the activity of such conspirators, surrenders its integrity or modifies its policy.

Along with the proof of our character as a nation must go the proof of our power to play the part that legitimately belongs to us. The people of the United States love peace. They respect the rights and covet the friendship of all other nations. They desire neither any additional territory nor any advantage which cannot peacefully be gained by their skill, their industry, or their enterprise; but they insist upon having absolute freedom of national life and policy and feel that they owe it to themselves and to the rôle of spirited independence which it is their sole ambition to play that they should render themselves secure against the hazard of interference from any quarter, and should be able to protect their rights upon the seas or in any part of the world. We therefore favor the maintenance of an army fully adequate to the requirements of order, of safety, and of the protection of the nation's rights, the fullest development of modern methods of seacoast defence, and the maintenance of an adequate reserve of citizens trained to arms and prepared to safeguard the people and territory of the United States against any danger of hostile action which may unexpectedly arise; and a fixed policy for the continuous development of a navy worthy to support the great naval traditions of the United States and fully equal to the international tasks which the United States hopes and expects to take a part in performing. The plans and enactments of the present Congress afford substantial proof of our purpose in this exigent matter.

The Democratic Administration has throughout the present war scrupulously and successfully held to the old paths of neutrality and of peaceful pursuit of the legitimate objects of our national life, which statesmen of all parties and creeds have prescribed for themselves in America since the beginning of our history. But the circumstances of the last two years have revealed necessities of international action which no former generation can have foreseen.

We hold that it is the duty of the United States to use its power, not only to make itself safe at home, but also to make secure its just interests throughout the world, and both for this end and in the interest of humanity to assist the world in securing settled peace and justice. We believe that every people has the right to choose the sovereignty under which it shall live; that the small States of the world have a right to enjoy from other nations the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon; and that the world has a right to be free from every disturbance of its peace that has its origin in aggression or disregard of the rights of peoples and nations; and we believe that the time has come when it is the duty of the United States to join the other nations of the world in any feasible association that will effectively serve these principles, to maintain inviolate the complete security of the highway of the seas for the common and unhindered use of all nations.

The present Administration has consistently sought to act upon and realize, in its conduct of the foreign affairs of the nation, the principle that should be the object of any association of the nations formed to secure the peace of the world and the maintenance of national and individual rights. It has followed the highest American traditions. It has preferred respect for the fundamental rights of smaller States, even to property interests, and has secured the friendship of the people of these States for the United States by refusing to make a more material interest an excuse for the assertion of our superior power against the dignity of their sovereign independence. It has regarded the lives of its citizens and the claims of humanity as of greater moment than material rights, and peace as the best basis for the just settlement of commercial claims. It has made the honor and ideals of the United States its standard alike in negotiation and action.

We recognize now, as we have always recognized, a definite and common interest between the United States with the other peoples and republics of the Western Hemisphere in all matters of national independence and free political development. We favor the establishment and maintenance of the closest relations of amity and mutual helpfulness between the United States and the other republics of the American continents for the support of peace and the promotion of a common prosperity. To that end we favor all measures which may be necessary to facilitate intimate intercourse and promote commerce between the United States and her neighbors to the south of us, and such international understandings as may be practicable and suitable to accomplish these ends.

We commend the action of the Democratic Administration in holding the Pan-American financial conference at Washington in May, 1915, and organizing the International High Commission, which represented the United States in the recent meeting of representatives of the Latin American Republics at Buenos Aires, April, 1916, which have so greatly promoted the friendly relations between the people of the Western Hemisphere.

The Monroe Doctrine is reasserted as a principle of Democratic faith. That doctrine guarantees the independent republics of the two Americas against aggression from another continent. It implies, as well, the most scrupulous regard upon our part for the sovereignty of each of them. The want of a stable, responsible Government in Mexico, capable of repressing and punishing marauders and bandit bands, who have not only taken the lives and seized and destroyed the property of American citizens in that country, but have insolently invaded our soil, made war upon and murdered our people thereon, has rendered it necessary temporarily to occupy, by our armed forces, a portion of the territory of that friendly State. Until, by the restoration of law and order therein, a repetition of such incursions is improbable, the necessity for their remaining will continue.

Intervention, implying as it does, military subjugation, is revolting to the people of the United States, notwithstanding the provocation to that course has been great and should be resorted to, if at all, only as a last resort. The stubborn resistance of the President and his advisers to every demand and suggestion to enter upon it, is creditable alike to them and to the people in whose name he speaks.

For the safeguarding and quickening of the life of our own people, we favor the conservation and development of the natural resources of the country through a policy which shall be positive rather than negative — a policy which shall not withhold such resources from development, but which, while permitting and encouraging their use, shall prevent both waste and monopoly in their exploitation, and we earnestly favor the passage of acts which will accomplish these objects and we reaffirm the declaration of the platform of 1912 on this subject.

The policy of reclaiming our arid lands should be steadily adhered to.

We favor the vigorous prosecution of investigations and plans to render agriculture more profitable and country life more healthful, comfortable, and attractive, and we believe that this should be a dominant aim of the nation as well as of the States. With all its recent improvement, farming still lags behind other occupations in development as a business, and the advantages of an

advancing civilization have not accrued to rural communities in a fair proportion. Much has been accomplished in this field under the present Administration — far more than under any previous administration. In the Federal Reserve Act of the last Congress, and the Rural Credits Act of the present Congress, the machinery has been created which will make credit available to the farmer constantly and readily, and he has at last been put upon a footing of equality with the merchant and the manufacturer in securing the capital necessary to carry on his enterprises. Grades and standards necessary to the intelligent and successful conduct of the business of agriculture have also been established, or are in the course of establishment by law. The long-needed Cotton Futures Act, passed by the Sixty-Third Congress, has now been in successful operation for nearly two years. A Grain Grades Bill, long needed, and a permissive Warehouse Bill, intended to provide better storage facilities, and to enable the farmer to obtain certificates upon which he may secure advances of money, have been passed by the House of Representatives, have been favorably reported to the Senate, and will probably become law during the present session of the Congress. Both houses have passed a good-roads measure, which will be of far-reaching benefit to all agricultural communities. Above all, the most extraordinary and significant progress has been made, under the direction of the Department of Agriculture, in extending and perfecting practical farm demonstration work which is so rapidly substituting scientific for empirical farming. But it is also necessary that rural activities should be better directed through coöperation and organization, that unfair methods of competition should be eliminated, and the conditions requisite for the just, orderly, and economical marketing of farm products created. We approve the Democratic Administration for having emphatically directed attention for the first time to the essential interests of agriculture involved in farm marketing and finance, for creating the Office of Markets and Rural Organization in connection with the Department of Agriculture, and for extending the coöperative machinery necessary for conveying information to farmers by means of demonstrations. We favor continued liberal provision, not only for the benefit of production, but also for the study and solution of problems of farm marketing and finance and for the extension of existing agencies for improving country life.

The happiness, comfort, and prosperity of rural life and the development of the city are alike conserved by the construction of public highways. We, therefore, favor national aid in the construction of post-roads and roads for like purposes.

We hold that the life, health, and strength of the men, women,

and children of the nation are its greatest asset and that in the conservation of these the Federal Government, wherever it acts as the employer of labor, should, both on its own account and as an example, put into effect the following principles of just employment:—

1. A living wage for all employees.
2. A working day not to exceed eight hours, with one day of rest in seven.
3. The adoption of safety appliances and the establishment of thoroughly sanitary conditions of labor.
4. Adequate compensation for industrial accidents.
5. The standards of the "Uniform Child Labor Law," wherever minors are employed.
6. Such provisions for decency, comfort and health in the employment of women as should be accorded the mothers of the race.
7. An equitable retirement law providing for the retirement of superannuated and disabled employees of the civil service, to the end that a higher standard of efficiency may be maintained.

We believe also that the adoption of similar principles should be urged and applied in the legislation of the States with regard to labor within their borders, and that through every possible agency the life and health of the people of the nation should be conserved.

We declare our faith in the Seamen's Act, passed by the Democratic Congress, and we promise our earnest continuance of its enforcement.

We favor the speedy enactment of an effective Federal Child Labor Law and the regulation of the shipment of prison-made goods in interstate commerce.

We favor the creation of a Federal Bureau of Safety in the Department of Labor, to gather facts concerning industrial hazards and to recommend legislation concerning the maiming and killing of human beings.

We favor the extension of the powers and functions of the Federal Bureau of Mines.

We favor the development upon a systematic scale of the means already begun under the present Administration, to assist laborers throughout the nation to seek and obtain employment, and the extension by the Federal Government of the same assistance and encouragement as is now given to agricultural training.

We heartily commend our newly established Department of Labor for its excellent record in settling industrial strikes by personal advice and through conciliating agents.

We favor a thorough reconsideration of the means and methods by which the Federal Government handles questions of public health, to the end that human life may be conserved by the elimi-

nation of loathsome disease, the improvement of sanitation, and the diffusion of a knowledge of disease prevention.

We favor the establishment by the Federal Government of tuberculosis sanitariums for needy tubercular patients.

We favor such an alteration of the rules of procedure of the Senate of the United States as will permit the prompt transaction of the nation's legislative business.

We demand careful economy in all expenditures for the support of the Government and to that end favor a return by the House of Representatives to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee chosen from its membership, in order that responsibility may be centred, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication in the public service as much as possible avoided. We favor this as a practicable first step towards a budget system.

We reaffirm our declarations for the rigid enforcement of the civil service laws.

We heartily endorse the provisions of the bill recently passed by the House of Representatives, further promoting self-government in the Philippine Islands as being in fulfilment of the policy declared by the Democratic party in its last national platform, and we reiterate our endorsement of the purpose of ultimate independence for the Philippine Islands, expressed in the preamble of that measure.

We recommend the extension of the franchise to the women of the country by the States upon the same terms as to men.

We again declare the policy that the sacred rights of American citizenship must be preserved at home and abroad, and that no treaty with any other Government shall receive the sanction of our Government which does not expressly recognize the absolute equality of all our citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or previous nationality, and which does not recognize the right of expatriation. The American Government should protect American citizens in their rights, not only at home, but abroad, and any country having a government should be held to strict accountability for any wrongs done them, either to person or property. At the earliest practical opportunity, our country should strive earnestly for peace among the warring nations of Europe and seek to bring about the adoption of the fundamental principle of justice and humanity, that all men shall enjoy equality of right and freedom from discrimination in the lands wherein they dwell.

We demand that the modern principles of prison reform be applied in our federal penal system. We favor such work for prisoners as shall give them training in remunerative occupations, so that they may make an honest living when released from prison;

the setting apart of the net wages of the prisoner, to be paid to his dependent family or to be reserved for his own use upon his release; the liberal extension of the principles of the Federal Parole Law, with due regard both to the welfare of the prisoner and the interests of society; the adoption of the probation system, especially in the case of first offenders not convicted of serious crimes.

We renew the declarations of recent Democratic platforms relating to generous pensions for soldiers and their widows, and call attention to our record of performance in this particular.

We renew the declaration in our last two platforms relating to the development of our waterways. The recent devastation of the lower Mississippi Valley and several other sections by floods accentuates the movement for the regulation of river flow by additional bank and levee protection below, and diversion, storage, and control of the flood waters above, and their utilization for beneficial purposes in the reclamation of arid and swamp lands, and development of water-power, instead of permitting the floods to continue, as heretofore, agents of destruction. We hold that the control of the Mississippi River is a national problem. The preservation of the depth of its waters for purposes of navigation, the building of levees and works of bank protection to maintain the integrity of its channel and prevent the overflow of its valley resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, impose an obligation which alone can be discharged by the National Government.

We favor the adoption of a liberal and comprehensive plan for the development and improvement of our harbors and inland waterways with economy and efficiency, so as to permit their navigation by vessels of standard draft.

It has been and will be the policy of the Democratic party to enact all laws necessary for the speedy development of Alaska and its great natural resources.

We favor granting to the people of Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico the traditional Territorial Government accorded to the Territories of the United States since the beginning of our Government, and we believe the officials appointed to administer the Government of those several Territories should be qualified by previous *bona fide* residence.

We unreservedly endorse our President and Vice-President, Woodrow Wilson of New Jersey, and Thomas Riley Marshall of Indiana, who have performed the functions of their great offices faithfully and impartially and with distinguished ability.

In particular, we commend to the American people the splendid diplomatic victories of our great President, who has preserved the

vital interests of our Government and its citizens and kept us out of war.

Woodrow Wilson stands to-day the greatest American of his generation.

This is a critical hour in the history of America, a critical hour in the history of the world. Upon the record above set forth, which shows great constructive achievement in following out a consistent policy for our domestic and internal development; upon the record of the Democratic Administration, which has maintained the honor, the dignity, and the interests of the United States and at the same time retained the respect and friendship of all the nations of the world, and upon the great policies for the future strengthening of the life of our country, the enlargement of our national vision, and the ennobling of our international relations, as set forth above, we appeal with confidence to the voters of the country.

SOCIALIST PARTY

[The Socialist party held no national convention, but nominated its candidates and adopted its platform by mail referendum.]

Candidates

For President, Allan L. Benson, of New York.

For Vice-President, George R. Kirkpatrick, of New Jersey.

Platform

In the midst of the greatest crisis and bloodiest struggle of all history the Socialist Party of America reaffirms its steadfast adherence to the principles of internationalism, world peace, and industrial democracy.

The great war which has engulfed so much of civilization and cost millions of lives is one of the natural fruits of the capitalist system of production. Fundamentally, it is the desire and effort of competing national groups of capitalists to grasp and control the opportunities for profitable investment which brought about the war, and it is that same desire which prompts the present organized effort to fasten upon this country the crushing burdens of militarism. Not until the capitalist system of production is destroyed and replaced by industrial democracy will wars for markets cease and international peace be securely established.

Hideous as they are, the horrors of the far-stretched battlefields of the old world are dwarfed by the evil results of the capitalist system, even in normal times. Instead of being organized to pro-

vide all the members of society with an abundance of food, clothing, and shelter, and the highest attainable freedom and culture, industry is at present organized and conducted for the benefit of a parasitic class. All the powers of government, and all our industrial genius, are directed to the end of securing to the relatively small class of capitalist investors the largest amount of profit which can be wrung from the labor of the ever increasing class whose only property is muscle and brawn, manual and mental labor power.

The dire consequences of this system are everywhere apparent. The workers are oppressed to the very limit of their endurance and deprived of all that makes for physical, mental, and moral well-being. Year by year poverty destroys more lives than all the armies and navies of the world and the lives destroyed and broken by industry in normal years in this country exceed those of all the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

To preserve their privilege and power is the most vital interest of the possessing class, while it is the most vital interest of the working class to resist oppression, improve its position, and struggle to obtain security of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Hence there exists a conflict of interests, a social war within the nation which is capable of no truce or compromise. So long as the few own and control the economic life of the nation, the many must be enslaved, poverty must exist, and riotous luxury and civil strife prevail.

The Socialist Party would end these conditions by reorganizing the life of the nation upon the basis of Socialism. Contrary to the charge made by the hired retainers and defenders of Privilege, it would not abolish private property, but greatly extend it. We believe that every human being should have and own all the things which that individual can use to advantage, for the enrichment of his own life, without imposing disadvantage or burden upon any other human being. Socialism requires the private ownership and individual direction of all things, tools, economic processes and functions which are individualistic in character equally with the collective ownership and democratic control and direction of those which are social or collectivistic in character. Private ownership and direction of wheelbarrows imperils no man's freedom or well-being; private ownership and direction of railways, mines, and factories makes their owners masters of the lives of their fellow men.

We hold that this country cannot enjoy happiness and prosperity at home and maintain lasting peace with other nations, so long as its industrial wealth is monopolized by a capitalist oligarchy. In this as in every other campaign all special issues arising from

temporary situations, whether domestic or foreign, must be subordinated to the major issue — the need of such a reorganization of our economic life as will remove the land, the mines, forests, railroads, mills, and factories, all the things required for our physical existence, from the clutches of industrial and financial freebooters and place them securely and permanently in the hands of the people.

We demand the immediate abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine as a danger so great that even its advocates are agreed that it constitutes perhaps our greatest single danger of war. The Monroe Doctrine was originally intended to safeguard the peace of the United States. Though the doctrine has changed from a safeguard to a menace, the capitalist class still defends it for the reason that our great capitalists desire to retain South and Central America as their private trade preserve. We favor the cultivation of social and political friendship with all other nations in the Western Hemisphere as an approach to a world confederation of nations, but we oppose the Monroe Doctrine because it takes from our hands the peace of America and places it in the custody of any nation that would attack the sovereignty of any state in the Western World.

If men were free to labor to satisfy their desires there could be in this country neither poverty nor involuntary unemployment. But men in this country are not free to labor to satisfy their desires. The great industrial population can labor only when the capitalist class, who own the industries, believe they can market their product at a profit. The needs of millions are based upon the greeds of a few. The situation is not unlike that of a pyramid balanced upon its apex. Oftentimes this pyramid tumbles and industrial depression comes. There was such a crash in 1907. If the capitalist owners had been willing to get out of the way, industry could have been revived in a day. But the capitalist owners are never willing to get out of the way. Their greed comes first — the people's needs, if at all, afterward. Therefore business did not quickly revive after the industrial depression of 1907. Mr. Taft was elected to bring good times, but in four years failed to bring them. Mr. Wilson was elected to bring good times, but not all of the measures he advocated had the slightest effect upon industry. It was only when the breaking out of war in Europe brought to this country tremendous orders for military supplies that the country entered upon what is called "prosperity" and which is really prosperity for the few who are profiting from the trade in ammunition, food, and other goods. We deny, however, that for the masses of the people there is any real prosperity, and we assert that for millions there is real poverty. As against the boast of the present National Ad-

ministration that its political programme, now fully in force, has brought prosperity to the masses, we place Federal Public Health Bulletin No. 76, issued in the spring of 1916 and signed by Dr. B. S. Warren, surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, in which the statement is made that eight hundred dollars a year is required to enable a family to avoid physical deterioration through lack of food; that more than half the families of workingmen receive less than that amount; that nearly a third receive less than five hundred dollars a year and that one family in twelve receives less than three hundred dollars a year. As proof of what insufficient food is doing to the bodies of millions of people, we point to the fact that medical examiners in the army are this year rejecting four fifths of the young men who seek to enter the army, and that this tremendous percentage of physically unfit, while alarming, is not unusually large. At Ludlow, Youngstown, Calumet, Bayonne, and in West Virginia, labor has fought against great odds for its right to exist, while capitalist government, by persecuting labor leaders, has lent itself to the subjugation of the workers.

The capitalist class, for a great many years has been trying to saddle upon this country a greater army and a greater navy. A greater army is desired to keep the working class of the United States in subjection.

A greater navy is desired to safeguard the foreign investments of American capitalists and to "back up" American diplomacy in its efforts to gain foreign markets for American capitalists. The war in Europe, which diminished and is still diminishing the remote possibility of European attack upon the United States, was nevertheless seized upon by capitalists and by unscrupulous politicians as a means of spreading fear throughout the country to the end that, by false pretences, great military establishments might be obtained. We denounce such "preparedness" as both false in principle, unnecessary in character, and dangerous in its plain tendencies toward militarism. We advocate that sort of social preparedness which expresses itself in better homes, better bodies, and better minds, which are alike the products of plenty and the necessity of effective defence in war.

The Socialist Party maintains its attitude of unalterable opposition to war. But upon behalf of the working class we demand that the power be taken from the President by which he may lead the nation into a position from which there is no escape from war. No man, however exalted in official station, should have the power to decide the question of peace or war for a nation of a hundred millions. To give one man such power is neither democratic nor safe. Yet the President has such power when he exercises the sole right to determine what shall be the nation's foreign policies and

what shall be the nature and tone of its diplomatic intercourse with other nations. We, therefore, demand that the power to fix foreign policies and conduct diplomatic negotiations shall be lodged in the Congress, the people reserving the right by referendum to order the Congress, at any time, to change its foreign policy. We also reiterate and emphasize the fact that Socialism will abolish the causes of war and thereby make war a thing of the past.

The Socialist Party is in favor of and demands the immediate recognition of the independence of the Philippine Islands, as a measure of justice both to the Filipinos and to ourselves. The Filipinos are entitled to self-government; we are entitled to be freed from the necessity of building and maintaining enough dreadnoughts to defend them in the event of war.

As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim, the Coöperative Commonwealth, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following programme:—

(1) The immediate repeal of all laws and appropriations for the increase of the military and naval forces of the United States.

(2) The power to establish the relations of this country with foreign nations shall be taken from the President and vested in Congress. All diplomatic negotiations shall be conducted publicly. No war shall be declared by the United States without a referendum vote of the entire people, except in the case of an invasion of its territory.

(3) The Government of the United States shall call a congress of all neutral nations to mediate between the belligerent powers in an effort to establish an immediate and lasting peace without indemnities or annexation of territory, except as based upon popular vote of the territory involved, and based upon a binding and enforceable international treaty, which shall provide for concerted disarmament on land and sea and for an international congress with power to adjust all disputes between nations.

(4) The Philippine Islands shall immediately be given full political freedom and independence, the United States surrendering all claims to the possession and government of any part of their territory.

(5) Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women. The immediate adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the suffrage to women on equal terms with men.

(6) The adoption of the initiative, referendum, and recall, and proportional representation, nationally as well as locally.

(7) The abolition of the Senate and of the veto power of the President.

(8) The election of the President and the Vice-President by direct vote of the people.

(9) The abolition of the present restriction upon the amendment of the Constitution so that that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in the country.

(10) The calling of a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States.

(11) The abolition of the power usurped by the Supreme Court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed only by act of Congress or by a referendum vote of the whole people.

(12) The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.

(13) The election of all judges of the United States Courts for short terms.

(14) The free administration of the law.

(15) The granting of the right of suffrage in the District of Columbia with representation in Congress and a democratic form of municipal government for purely local affairs.

(16) The extension of democratic form of government to all United States territory.

(17) The freedom of press, speech, and assemblage.

(18) The increase of the rates of the present income tax and corporation tax and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the value of the estate and to nearness of kin — the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry.

(19) The enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits. The Bureau of Education to be made a department.

(20) The enactment of further measures for the conservation of health and the creation of an independent Department of Health.

(21) The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of collective ownership, with direct rewards to inventors by premiums or royalties.

(1) The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, telegraphs and telephones, express service, steamboat lines, and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

(2) The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the States, or the Federal Government of all grain elevators, stockyards, storage warehouses, and other distributing agencies, in order to relieve

the farmer from the extortionate charges of the middleman and to reduce the present high cost of living.

(3) The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water-power.

(4) The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people :—

(a) By scientific forestation and timber protection.

(b) By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.

(c) By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water-power.

(d) By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.

(e) By the development of highway and waterway systems.

(5) The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation or exploitation.

(6) All currency shall be issued by the Government of the United States and shall be legal tender for the payment of taxes and impost duties and for the discharge of public and private debts. The Government shall lend money on bonds to counties and municipalities at a nominal rate of interest for the purpose of taking over or establishing public utilities and for building or maintaining public roads and highways and public schools — up to twenty-five per cent of the assessed valuation of such counties or municipalities. Said bonds are to be repaid in twenty equal and annual installments, and the currency issued for the purpose by the Government is to be cancelled and destroyed *seriatim* as the debt is repaid. All banks and banking institutions shall be owned by the Government of the United States or by the States.

(7) Government relief for the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the Government under a work day of not more than eight hours and at not less than the prevailing union wages. The Government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to States and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works; to contribute money to unemployment funds of labor unions and other organizations of workers; and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalistic class.

The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families :—

(1) By shortening the work day in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

(2) By securing the freedom of political and economic organization and activity.

(3) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and half each week.

(4) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories, and mines.

(5) By forbidding the employment of children under eighteen years of age.

(6) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.

CONVENTION OF THE PROHIBITION PARTY, HELD AT
ST. PAUL, JULY 18

Candidates

For President, J. Frank Hanly, of Indiana.

For Vice President, Ira D. Landrith, of Massachusetts.

Platform

The Prohibition Party, assembled in its Twelfth National Convention in the city of St. Paul, Minnesota, on this Twentieth day of July, 1916, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of liberty, for our institutions and the multiplying signs of early victory for the cause for which the Party stands, in order that the people may know the source of its faith and the basis of its action, should it be clothed with governmental power, challenges the attention of the Nation and asks the votes of the people on this Declaration of principles.

We denounce the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We believe in its abolition. It is a crime—not a business—and should not have governmental sanction.

We demand—and if given power, we will effectuate the demand—that the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation and sale of alcoholic beverage purposes shall be prohibited.

To the accomplishment of that end, we pledge the exercise of all governmental power and amendment of statutes and the amendment of constitutions, State and National. Only by a political party committed to this purpose can such policy be made effective. We call upon all voters, so believing, to place the Prohibition Party in power upon this issue as a necessary step in the solution of the liquor problem.

The right of citizens of the United States to vote should not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. We declare in favor of the enfranchisement of women by amendments to State and Federal Constitutions.

We condemn the Republican and Democratic parties for their failure to submit an equal suffrage amendment to the National Constitution. We remind the four million women voters that our Party was the first to declare for their political rights, which it did in 1872. We invite their coöperation in electing the Prohibition Party to power.

We are committed to the policy of peace and friendliness with all nations. We are unalterably opposed to the wasteful military programme of the Democratic and Republican Parties. Militarism protects no worthy institution. It endangers them all. It violates the high principles which have brought us as a Nation to the present hour. We are for a constructive programme in preparedness for peace. We declare for and will promote a world court, to which national differences shall be submitted, so maintained as to give its decrees binding force.

We will support a compact among nations to dismantle navies and disband armies, but until such court and compact are established we pledge ourselves to maintain an effective army and navy and to provide coast defenses entirely adequate for national protection.

We are opposed to universal military service, and to participation in the rivalry that has brought Europe to the shambles and now imperils the civilization of the race.

Private profit, so far as constitutionally possible, should be taken out of the manufacture of war munitions and all war equipment.

In normal times we favor the employment of the army in vast reclamation plans, in reforesting hills and mountains, in building State and National highways, in the construction of an inland waterway from Florida to Maine, in the opening of Alaska and in unnumbered other projects which will make our soldiers constructive builders of peace. For such service there should be paid an adequate individual wage.

Those units of our navy which are capable of being converted into merchantmen and passenger vessels should be constructed with that purpose in view, and chiefly so utilized in time of peace.

We condemn the political parties, which for more than thirty years have allowed munition and war equipment manufacturers to plunder the people and to jeopardize the highest interest of the Nation by furnishing honey-combed armour plate and second rate battleships which the Navy League now declares are wholly inadequate.

We will not allow the country to forget that the first step toward physical, economic, moral and political preparedness is the enactment of National Prohibition.

The countries at war are preparing for a fierce industrial struggle to follow the cessation of hostilities. As a matter of commercial economy, international friendliness, business efficiency, and as a

help to peace, we demand that reciprocal trade treaties be negotiated with all nations with which we have trade relations. A Commission of specialists, free from the control of any party, should be appointed with power to gather full information of all phases of the questions of tariff and reciprocity, and to recommend such legislation as it deems necessary for the welfare of American business and labor.

The necessity of legislation to enable American ship builders or owners to meet foreign competition, on the most favorable terms, is obvious.

Materials for construction should be admitted free of duty.

The purchase of ships abroad, when low prices invite, should be allowed and, when so purchased, should be admitted to American registry.

Harbor rules and charges and navigation laws should not be onerous, but favorable to the highest degree.

Liberal payment should be made by the Government for the carrying of mails or for transport services.

All shipping from the United States to any of our possessions should be reserved to ships of American registry.

The people should not overlook the fact that the effect of Nation-wide Prohibition, on labor and industry generally, will be such as to lower the cost of ship building per unit, and at the same time permit the payment of higher wages. The increased volume of trade and commerce, which will result, when the wastage of the liquor traffic is stopped, will quicken our shipping on every sea and send our flag on peaceful missions into every port. This is urged as an incidental effect of wise action on the liquor question, but is none the less to be desired and will aid in the solution of the problem of our merchant marine.

Mexico needs not a conqueror, but a good Samaritan. We are opposed to the violation of the sovereignty of the Mexican people, and we will countenance no war of aggression against them. We pledge the help of this country in the suppression of lawless bands of marauders and murderers, who have taken the lives of American citizens, on both sides of the border, as well as of Mexicans in their own country.

The lives and property of our citizens, when about their lawful pursuits, either in the United States or in Mexico, must and will be protected. In the event of a break-down of government across the border, we would use, in the interests of civilization, the force necessary for the establishment of law and order.

In this connection we affirm our faith in the Monroe Doctrine, proclaimed in the early days of the Nation's life and unswervingly maintained for nearly a hundred years.

We cannot claim the benefits of the Doctrine and refuse to as-

sume or discharge the responsibility and the duties which inhere therein and flow therefrom.

Those duties have long been unmet in Mexico. We should meet them now, acting, not for territory, not for conquest or for ourselves alone, but for and with all the nations of North and South America.

The Democratic party has blundered, and four years ago the Republican party evaded and passed on the problem it now asks the opportunity to solve.

The abandonment of the Philippines at this time would be an injustice to them and a violation of our plain duty. As soon as they are prepared for self-government, by education and training, they should be granted their independence on terms just to themselves and us.

We reaffirm our declaration in favor of conservation of forests, water power and other natural resources.

Departmental decisions ought not to be final, but the rights of the people should be protected by provision for court review.

In order that the public service may be of the highest standard, the government should be a model employer in all respects. To enforce the civil service law in spirit as well as in letter, all promotions should be non-political, based only upon proven fitness; all recommendations for demotions or removals from the service should be subjected to the review of a non-partisan board or commission.

The merit system should be extended to cover all postmasters, collectors of revenue, marshals and other such public officials whose duties are purely administrative.

We reaffirm our allegiance to the principle of secure tenure of office, during good behavior and capable effort, as the means of obtaining expert service. We declare for the enactment of an equitable retirement law for disabled and superannuated employees, in return for faithful service rendered, to maintain a high degree of efficiency in public office.

We stand for Americanism. We believe this country was created for a great mission among the nations of the earth. We rejoice in the fact that it has offered asylum to the oppressed of other lands and for those, more fortunately situated, who yet wished to improve their condition. It is the land of all peoples and belongs not to any one — it is the heritage of all. It should come first in the affections of every citizen, and he who loves another land more than this is not fit for citizenship here, but he is a better citizen who, loving his country, has reverence for the land of his fathers and gains from its history and traditions that which inspires him to nobler service to the one in which he lives.

The Federal Government should interest itself in helping the

newcomer into that vocation and locality where he shall most quickly become an American. Those fitted by experience and training for agricultural pursuits should be encouraged to develop the millions of acres of rich and idle land.

We favor uniform marriage and divorce laws, the extermination of polygamy and the complete suppression of the traffic in women and girls.

Differences between capital and labor should be settled through arbitration, by which the rights of the public are conserved as well as those of the disputants. We declare for the prohibition of child labor in factories, mines and workshops; an eight-hour maximum day, with one day of rest in seven; for more rigid sanitary requirements and such working conditions as shall foster the physical and moral well-being of the unborn; for the protection of all who toil, by the extension of Employers' Liability Acts; for the adoption of safety appliance for the safeguarding of labor; and for laws that will promote the just division of the wealth which labor and capital jointly produce. Provision should be made for those who suffer from industrial accidents and occupational diseases.

We pledge a business-like administration of the Nation's affairs; the abolition of useless offices, bureaus and commissions; economy in the expenditure of public funds; efficiency in governmental service; and the adoption of the budget system. The President should have power to veto any single item or items of an appropriation bill.

We condemn, and agree when in power to remedy, that which is known as "pork barrel" legislation, by which millions of dollars have been appropriated for rivers where there is no commerce, harbors where there are no ships and public buildings where there is no need.

We are in favor of a single presidential term of six years.

Public utilities and other resources that are natural monopolies are at the present time exploited for personal gain under a monopolistic system. We demand the public ownership or control of all such utilities by the people and their operation and administration in the interests of all the people.

We stand for the preservation and development of our free institutions and for absolute separation of church and state with the guaranty of full religious and civil liberty.

We stand for the rights, safety, justice and development of humanity; we believe in the equality of all before the law; in old-age pensions and insurance against unemployment and in help for needy mothers, all of which could be provided from what is now wasted in drink.

While it is admitted that grain and cotton are fundamental

factors in our national life, it cannot be denied that proper assistance and protection are not given these commodities at terminal markets, in the course of inter-state commerce.

We favor and pledge our efforts to obtain grain elevators at necessary terminal markets, such elevators to be owned and operated by the Federal Government; also to secure Federal grain inspection under a system of civil service and to secure the abolition of any Board of Trade, Chamber of Commerce, or other place of gambling in grain or trading in "options" or "futures" or "short-selling," or any other form of so-called speculation wherein products are not received or delivered, but wherein so-called contracts are settled by the payment of "margins" or "differences" through clearing houses or otherwise.

This Party stands committed to free and open markets based upon legitimate supply and demand, absolutely free from questionable practices of market manipulation. We also favor government warehouses for cotton at proper terminals where the interests of producers require the same; and the absolute divorce of all railroad elevators or warehouses owned by railroad companies, either public or private, from operation and control of private individuals in competition with the public in merchandising grain, cotton or other farm products.


We furthermore endorse all proper methods among producers of those means of coöperative mutual enterprise, which tend toward broader and better markets for both producer and consumer.

This is the day of opportunity for the American people. The triumph of neither old political party is essential to our safety or progress. The defeat of either will be no public misfortune. They are one party. By age and wealth, by membership and traditions, by platforms and in the character of their candidates, they are the Conservative Party of the United States. The Prohibition Party as the promoter of every important measure of social justice presented to the American people in the last two generations, and as the originator of nearly all such legislation, remains now the only great Progressive Party.

The patriotic voters, who compose the Republican and Democratic parties, can, by voting the Prohibition ticket this year, elect the issue of National Prohibition.

To those, in whatever party, who have the vision of a land redeemed from drink, we extend a cordial invitation to join with us in carrying the banner of Prohibition to Nation-wide victory.

INDEX



INDEX

- Abolitionists**, condemned by the Democrats, **1**, 200, 266; convention of, in 1839, 202; in 1843, 216; defeat Clay, 224; convention in 1847, 232; in 1852, 253.
- Adams, Charles Francis**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 239; in canvass of 1872, 340, 344.
- Adams, John**, suggested for Vice-president, 1789, **1**, 24; elected, 27; his journey to New York, and inauguration, 30; reëlected Vice-President, 39; named for President, 44; virulent attacks upon him, 45; elected President, 51; counts the votes and declares his own election, 52; relations with the Federalist party, 56; defeated in 1800, 63; elector for Monroe, in 1820, 118.
- Adams, John Quincy**, goes over to the Republican party, **1**, 93; receives one vote for President in 1820, 118, 121; candidate in 1824, 126, 129, 131; popular votes for, 136; electoral votes, 140; chosen by the House of Representatives, 140; his character and administration, 142; attacks New England Federalists, 146; popular votes for in 1828, 149; member of Congress, 193; favors the acquisition of Cuba, **2**, 8.
- Adams, Samuel**, suggested for Vice-President, **1**, 24; his course in the canvass of 1796, 48; votes for, 51.
- Addams, Jane**, in the Progressive Convention of 1912, **2**, 298.
- Adet, Pierre Auguste**, French minister, endeavors to defeat the election of Adams, **1**, 46.
- Aguinaldo**, Filipino leader, **2**, 27, 77.
- Alabama**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 118.
- Alaska**, boundary question, **2**, 92, 109; government of, 122, 251, 268, 270, 294.
- Aldrich, Nelson W.**, **2**, 6, 7, 225; his currency plan opposed by the Democrats, 265; by the Progressives, 293.
- Alien and Sedition Laws**, **1**, 57, 201.
- Alien ownership of land**. See *Land, public*.
- Allison, William B.**, **1**, 392, 538.
- American party**. See *Native American*.
- American party of 1888**, convention, **1**, 480.
- American Tobacco Company**, dissolution of, **1**, 232, 262.
- Annexation of Texas**. See *Texas*.
- Anthracite coal strike**, in 1902, **2**, 93.
- Anti-Federalist party**, **1**, 32. See also *Republican party*.
- "Anti-imperialism,"** **2**, 24, 41, 58, 67, 68, 72, 73, 120, 269.
- Anti-imperialist League**, convention of 1900, **2**, 69.
- Anti-imperialists**, conference of, in 1900, **2**, 68.
- Anti-Masonic party**, its origin, **1**, 155; merged with the Whig party, 180.
- Anti-monopoly party**, convention of, in 1884, **1**, 421.
- Anti-Nebraska Democrats**, **1**, 260.
- "Anti-Snappers,"** of 1892, **1**, 493.
- Arbitrary arrests during the Civil War**, **1**, 298, 304.
- Arbitration** of international disputes, **1**, 256, 365, 441, 462, 466, 507, 520, 521, 560; **2**, 247, 264, 285.
- Arizona**, question of its admission, **2**, 49, 62, 67, 122, 144, 178, 193; admitted to the Union, 223, 270.
- Arkansas**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 184; electoral vote of, in 1872 objected to and excluded, 354.
- Armstrong, James**, votes for in 1789, **1**, 27.
- Army Vote**, in 1864, **1**, 307.
- Arthur, Chester A.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 408; elected, 417; becomes President, 419; in the canvass of 1884, 427, 432.
- Ashburton Treaty**, **1**, 238, 250.

- Baldwin, Simeon E.**, candidate for Democratic nomination, 2, 255; votes for, in convention of 1912, 259.
- Ballinger, Richard A.**, Secretary of the Interior, contest over, 2, 221.
- Bank of the United States**, second bank incorporated, 1, 108; war upon, by Jackson, 155, 157, 178; renewal of charter vetoed, 162; the panic of 1837, 191; Van Buren continues war upon, 192; condemned by Democrats, 200; Tyler's opposition to, 207; in plat-forms, 200.
- Banks, Nathaniel P.**, 1, 271; electoral vote for, in 1873, 353.
- Banks, national**, in politics and plat-forms, 1, 333, 365, 367, 409, 544, 551; 2, 265.
- Barbour, James**, 1, 114, 119, 145, 194.
- Barker, Wharton**, candidate for Presi-dent, 2, 42.
- "Barnburners,"** Democratic faction, 1, 229; convention in 1848, 238.
- Bayard, James A.**, reasons for aban-doning Burr, 1, 71.
- Bayard, Thomas F.**, 1, 349, 379, 387, 412, 414, 415, 440.
- Bell, John**, nominated for President, 1, 289; popular and electoral votes for, 297.
- Benson, Allan L.**, nominated for President, 2, 360.
- Bentley, Charles E.**, nominated for President, 1, 532; popular votes for, 567.
- Beveridge, Albert S.**, 2, 254, 288.
- Bidwell, John**, nominated for Presi-dent, 1, 508.
- Bimetallism.** See *Silver*.
- Birney, James G.**, nominated for Presi-dent, 1, 202; popular votes for, 203; nominated in 1843, 216; popular votes for, 223; accused of seeking alli-ance with Democrats, 224.
- Bishop, Richard M.**, 1, 415.
- Bishop, James**, nominated for President, 1, 340; popular votes for, 352.
- Blaine, James G.**, 1, 330, 362, 368, 373, 402, 407, 408, 427; nominated for President, 432; popular and electoral votes for, 448; "Paris interview" on the tariff, 458; withdraws from the canvass in 1888, 459; attempt to stampede convention for, 478; Secretary of State, 489, 492; resigns, 493; votes for in the convention of 1892, 497; as Sec-etary of State holds the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty abrogated, 2, 79; his opinion of the Tenure-of-office Act, 315.
- Blair, Francis P., Jr.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 326; popular and electoral votes for, 328.
- "Bloody Shirt,"** waving the, 1, 357.
- Boer War**, 2, 41, 50, 63, 67.
- Boies, Horace**, 1, 505.
- Bonds**, taxation of United States, 1, 316, 322, 333, 336; payment of, with greenbacks, 316, 322, 333, 336; issue of, in time of peace, 544, 552, 556.
- Booth, Newton**, nominated for Vice-President, declined, 1, 367.
- Borah, William E.**, 2, 254.
- Borden, Robert L.**, Canadian states-man, 2, 231.
- Botts, John M.**, letter from, on Tyler, 1, 207; in the canvass of 1860, 289.
- Boutwell, George S.**, 2, 25.
- Boxer Insurrection in China**, 2, 83.
- Bradley, Stephen B.**, call for a con-gressional caucus in 1808, 1, 90.
- Bramlette, Thomas E.**, votes for as Vice-President in 1872, 1, 353.
- Breckinridge, John C.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 265; elected, 276; nominated for President, 285, 287; popular and electoral votes for, 297.
- Bristow, Benjamin H.**, 1, 363, 368, 373.
- "Broad Gauge" Prohibitionists**, 1, 528.
- Brooks, John A.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 468.
- Brown, B. Gratz**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 344, 349; electoral votes for, 353.
- Brown, John**, raid by, 1, 281.
- Brownsville affair**, 2, 153.
- Bryan, William J.**, 1, 542, 547; nomi-nated for President by the Democrats, 548; by the People's party, 554; by the National Silver party, 557; his per-sonal canvass, 563, 564; popular votes for, 567; electoral votes for, 568; his position on the Treaty of Paris, 2, 26; his leadership in the canvass of 1900, 31; nominated for President by the Fusion wing of the Populists, 39;

- dominates the Democratic convention of 1900, 56; nominated by that convention, 63; endorsed by the Anti-imperialists, 71; his activity in the pre-election canvass, 73; popular and electoral votes for, 75; opposition to, in 1904, 95; he opposes Judge Parker, 117; mildly supports the ticket, 133; in the canvass of 1908, 153, 157, 183; nominated for the third time, 196; his stumping tours, 206; popular and electoral votes for, 208; in the canvass of 1912, his influence in the Democratic convention, 256, 257, 259, 260.
- Buchanan, James, 1**, 138, 209; votes for in the convention of 1844; in that of 1848, 233; in the canvass of 1852, 247; the "Ostend Manifesto," 261; nominated for President, 265; elected, 276; his administration, 280.
- Buckner, Simon B.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 561.
- Bureau of Mines, 2**, 222.
- Burke, John, 2**, 271.
- Burr, Aaron**, votes for, in 1792, **1**, 39; candidate with Jefferson in 1796, 44; votes for, 51; nominated by the caucus, in 1800, 59; votes for, 63; becomes Vice-President, 73.
- Butler, Benjamin F., 1**, 283, 330; in electoral count of 1869, 331; in the canvass of 1880, 411; nominated for President, 423, 427; popular votes for, 448.
- Butler, William O.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 234; electoral votes for, 243; in canvass of 1852, 249.
- Caffery, Donelson**, nominated for President, declines, **2**, 72.
- Calhoun, John C., 1**, 98, 117; proposed for President, 126; candidate for Vice-President, 132; elected, 135; reelected, 149; suggested for President in 1844, 208; votes for, in convention, 212; negotiates treaty for annexation of Texas, 227; votes for, in convention of 1848, 233; the compromises of 1850, 245.
- California**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 246, 257; its vote divided in 1880, 418; in 1892, 517; in 1896, 566; its contested delegation in the Republican convention of 1912, **2**, 244.
- Cambon, Jules**, French ambassador at Washington, **2**, 23.
- Cambreleng, Churchill C.**, political mission in the South, **1**, 144.
- Campaign contributions by corporations**, publicity demanded, **2**, 149, 180, 201, 250, 263, 290.
- Canada**, reciprocity with, **2**, 229.
- Canal, Isthmian**, construction of, advocated in party platforms, **1**, 476, 497, 502, 535; **2**, 50, 62, 66; negotiations with Colombia, 88; construction of Panama Canal assured, 91; other references, 106, 122, 178, 193, 235, 252, 269, 295.
- Cannon, Joseph G., 2**, 14, 156, 181, 223, 252, 269.
- Canvass of 1900**, characteristics of, **2**, 72; of 1904, 133; of 1908, 206; of 1912, 298.
- Carlisle, John G., 1**, 440.
- "Carpet-baggers," 1**, 357.
- Carroll, George W.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 112.
- Cary, Samuel F.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 367.
- Cass, Lewis**, votes for, in convention of 1844, **1**, 209; nominated for President, 233; popular and electoral votes for, 243; in canvass of 1852, 247.
- Casus omissus, 1**, 119, 271, 450.
- Caucus congressional**, nominations, Federalist and Republican, in 1800, **1**, 58, 59; Jefferson and George Clinton nominated in 1804, 82; opposition to the caucus, in 1808, 90; Madison nominated, 91; nominations in 1812, 99; opposition to, in 1816, 109; abortive caucus in 1820, 117; discussion of and war against, 1822-24, 126, 130; result of, 131; faults of the system, 168.
- Chafin, Eugene W.**, nominated for President in 1908, **2**, 198; popular votes for, 208; nominated in 1912, 285; popular votes for, 302.
- Chambers, B. J.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 411.
- Chase, Salmon P., 1**, 270, 290, 294, 321, 325, 340, 344.
- Chase, Solon, 1**, 423, 427.
- Cherokee and Creek Indians**, their removal, **1**, 154, 157.
- Child labor**, in platforms, **2**, 116, 149, 160, 167, 193, 198, 246, 285, 289, 348, 367.

- Chinese Immigration and labor**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 335, 336, 371, 377, 401, 405, 410, 414, 416, 419, 430, 438, 444, 462, 469, 474, 502; **2**, 63, 107.
- Cipher despatches**, **1**, 381.
- Citizenship** of inhabitants of Porto Rico, **2**, 78, 149, 178, 252.
- Civil Rights bill**, vetoed by President Johnson, **1**, 315.
- Civil Service Reform**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 153, 158, 334, 337, 343, 347, 370, 406, 419, 430, 437, 457, 466, 469, 477, 496, 501, 536, 546, 560; **2**, 49, 66, 68, 72, 107, 111, 123, 177, 193, 250, 269, 297, 345; history of the reform, 316, 370.
- Clay, Henry**, **1**, 98, 99; opposes the caucus, in 1816, 109; on electoral vote of Indiana, 113; on electoral vote of Missouri, 119; candidate for President in 1824, 126; suggestion of a coalition with Crawford, 132; popular votes for, 136; accused of a corrupt bargain, 138; electoral votes for, in 1824, 140; suggested for Vice-President in 1828, 145; nominated by National Republicans, 157; popular votes for, 163; electoral votes, 164; inquiry by, into qualifications of electors, 184; his attitude in 1839, 193; his letter on Texas, 210; nominated by the Whigs, in 1844, 220; popular and electoral votes for, 223; defeated by Abolitionists, 224; in the canvass of 1848, 230; defeated in convention, 237; the compromises of 1850, 245; his extension of the power of the Speaker, **2**, 336.
- Clayton-Bulwer Treaty**, **2**, 7, 79.
- Cleveland, Grover**, elected Governor of New York, **1**, 420, 433; nominated for President, 440; elected, 448; his appointments to office, 457; nominated for reelection, 471; popular and electoral votes for, in 1888, 483; in the canvass of 1892, 493; nominated in that year, 504; elected, 517; foreign relations during his second administration, 519; alienated from his party, 523; Democratic convention of 1896 refuses to approve his administration, 547; commended by National Democrats, 560; his unpleasant situation, 1894-97, **2**, 1; his attitude toward the Cuban rebellion, 10; withdraws treaty of annexation of Hawaii, 21; his use of the veto power, 324; of the legislative power, 328.
- Clinton, DeWitt**, **1**, 78, 79, 92; candidate for President, 100; votes for, in 1812, 104; candidate in 1824, 126; favors appointment of electors by popular vote, 147.
- Clinton, George**, candidate of the Anti-Federalists, **1**, 26; votes for, in 1789, 27; opposed to John Adams, in 1792, 34; votes for, as Vice-President in 1792, 39; votes for, in 1796, 51; nominated by caucus for Vice-President, 82; elected, 84; nominated in 1808, 91; repudiates the caucus, 92; reelected, 95; dies in office, 99.
- Coal strike**, in 1902, **2**, 93, 108.
- "Coastwise trade"** by way of the Panama Canal, **2**, 235.
- Cochrane, John**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 300; withdraws, 301.
- Cockrell, Francis M.**, **2**, 124.
- Colfax, Schuyler**, **1**, 318; nominated for Vice-President, in 1868, 321; elected, 328; defeated in 1872, 348.
- Colombia, Republic of**, blocks the Panama Canal, **2**, 89.
- Colorado**, bill to admit to the Union vetoed, **1**, 315; admitted, 380.
- Colquitt, Alfred H.**, votes for, as Vice-President in 1872, **1**, 353.
- Commerce Court**, established and abolished, **2**, 222.
- Commerce and Labor**, establishment of a Department of, advocated in platforms, **2**, 50, 62.
- Commission, Electoral**. See *Electoral Commission*.
- Common Carriers**, regulation of, **2**, 150, 222.
- Compromises of 1850**, **1**, 245; in platforms, 249, 252, 254, 258, 267.
- Conant, John A.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 442.
- Conkling, Roscoe**, **1**, 361, 368, 373, 402, 408, 419.
- Conservation of natural resources**, **2**, 151, 176, 194, 198, 222, 250, 267, 285, 294, 345, 349, 355, 366, 370.
- Constitutional Union party**, **1**, 282; convention in 1860, 288.
- "Constructive"** recess of the Senate, **2**, 318.

- Consular system**, in platforms, **2**, 50, 293.
- Contested seats** in the Republican convention of 1912, **2**, 242.
- Continental party**, convention of, in 1904, **2**, 130.
- Contributions to campaigns** by corporations, in platforms, **2**, 149, 180, 188, 201, 250, 263, 290.
- Conventions, national party:**
- Abolition, or Liberty party, in 1839, **1**, 202; in 1843, 216; in 1847, 239; in 1852, 253.
 - American, in 1888, **1**, 480.
 - Anti-imperialist League, in 1890, **2**, 69.
 - Anti-masonic, in 1839, **1**, 155.
 - Anti-monopoly, in 1884, **1**, 421.
 - "Barnburners," in 1848, **1**, 238.
 - Constitutional Union, in 1860, **1**, 288.
 - Continental party, in 1904, **2**, 130.
 - Democratic, in 1832, **1**, 160; in 1835, 181; in 1840, 199; in 1844, 211; in 1848, 232; in 1852, 248; in 1856, 264; in 1860, 282; of seceders, 285, 286; convention in 1864, 304; in 1868, 321; in 1872, 349; of "Straight" Democrats, 349; convention in 1876, 374; in 1880, 411; in 1884, 433; in 1888, 468; in 1892, 498; in 1896, 541; in 1900, **2**, 56; in 1904, 117; in 1908, 197; in 1912, 255; in 1915, 350.
 - Free Soil, in 1848, **1**, 238; in 1852, 253.
 - Greenback party, in 1876, **1**, 367; in 1880, 409; in 1884, 423.
 - Independence party, in 1908, **2**, 199.
 - Know Nothing party, in 1856, **1**, 261.
 - Labor Reformers, in 1872, **1**, 335.
 - Liberal Republicans, in 1872, **1**, 340.
 - Liberty League, in 1848, **1**, 232.
 - National Democratic, in 1896, **1**, 557.
 - National Liberty party in 1904, **2**, 127.
 - National Republican, in 1831, **1**, 157; of young men, in 1832, 157.
 - National party, in 1896, **1**, 530.
 - National Silver party, in 1896, **1**, 555.
 - Native American, in 1847, **1**, 231; in 1856, 261.
 - People's (Populist) party, in 1892, **1**, 508; in 1896, 550;
 - Fusion wing, in 1900, **2**, 39;
 - Middle-of-the-road wing, in 1900, **2**, 42; in 1904, 114; in 1908, 158.
 - Progressive party, in 1912, **2**, 285; in 1916, 346.
 - Prohibition party, in 1872, **1**, 339; in 1876, 364; in 1880, 411; in 1884, 441; in 1888, 465; in 1892, 505; in 1896, 532; in 1900, **2**, 51; in 1904, 109; in 1908, 169; in 1912, 284; in 1916, 367.
 - Radical Republican, in 1864, **1**, 299.
 - Republican, in 1856, **1**, 269; in 1860, 290; in 1864, 301; in 1868, 318; in 1872, 345; in 1876, 368; in 1880, 402; in 1884, 427; in 1888, 247; in 1892, 494; in 1896, 532; in 1900, **2**, 45; in 1904, 104; in 1908, 197; in 1912, 240; in 1916, 340.
 - Silver Republican party, in 1900, **2**, 64.
 - Socialist party, in 1900, **2**, 34; in 1904, 97; in 1908, 169; in 1912, 276; in 1916, 360.
 - Socialist Labor party, in 1892, **1**, 513; in 1896, 538; in 1900, **2**, 44; in 1904, 97; in 1908, 182; in 1912, 272; in 1916, 339.
 - Union Christian party, in 1900, **2**, 37; in 1904, 103.
 - Union and Harmony, in 1839, **1**, 194.
 - Union Labor, in 1888, **1**, 460.
 - United Labor party, in 1888, **1**, 463.
 - United Reform party, in 1900, **2**, 36.
 - Whig, in 1839, **1**, 193; in 1844, 220; in 1848, 237; in 1852, 250; in 1856, 273.
- Convention system, the**, the first national convention, **1**, 101; convention suggested in Pennsylvania, 1824, 130; the system discussed, 166; origin of the system, 170; reforms made and suggested, 174, 175, 420, 428; **2**, 271.
- Cooper, Peter**, nominated for President, **1**, 367; popular vote for, 383.
- Copperheads**, **1**, 298.
- Copyright**, **2**, 149.
- Corporations**, campaign contributions by, in platforms, **2**, 149, 180, 188, 201, 223, 250, 263, 290.
- Corregan, Charles H.**, nominated for President, **2**, 114.
- Corrupt bargain**, alleged, of Henry Clay, **1**, 138.
- Count of electoral votes.** See *Electoral votes*.
- Courts and judges**, in politics and platforms, **2**, 62, 116, 160, 175, 223, 247, 266, 290.

- Cowdrey, Robert H.**, nominated for President, **1**, 465; popular votes for, 483.
- Cox, William W.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 114.
- Cranfill, J. B.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 508.
- Cravens, Jordan E.**, proposes amendment of the Constitution, **1**, 394.
- Crawford, William H.**, **1**, 98; intrigue in favor of, 109; favorite of the administration, 126; candidate of the caucus, 131; popular votes for, in 1824, 136; electoral votes, 140; votes for in the House of Representatives, 141; suggested for Vice-President, in 1828, 145; his quarrel with Monroe, 145 (note).
- Credit Mobilier**, **1**, 416.
- Creeks**. See *Cherokees*.
- Crittenden, John J.**, **1**, 275, 289.
- Crum, William D.**, case of, **2**, 226.
- Cuba**, acquisition of, **1**, 261, 272, 284, 287; the rebellion in, 1895, 520, 536, 540, 553; **2**, 9; attitude of Presidents Cleveland and McKinley, 10, 13; action of Congress, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20; attitude of parties, 12, 69, 105; government established, 80; intervention by the United States, 146, 177.
- Cummins, Albert B.**, **2**, 253.
- Currency, the**, in politics and platforms. See *Greenbacks* and *Silver*.
- Curtis, James L.**, nominated for President, **1**, 480.
- Cushing, Caleb**, **1**, 282, 285, 286.
- "Czar,"** Mr. Speaker Reed as, **1**, 488.
- Dallas, George M.**, **1**, 162; nominated for Vice-President, 214; elected, 223; votes for in 1848, 233.
- Daniel, John W.**, **2**, 119.
- Daniel, William**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 446.
- Danish West Indies**, **2**, 82, 91.
- Davis, David**, nominated for President, **1**, 338; declines, 339; in Liberal Republican convention, 344; electoral vote for, 353; elected senator, 388.
- Davis, Henry G.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 126.
- Davis, Henry Winter**, on power to count electoral votes, **1**, 277.
- Davis, Jefferson**, **1**, 284.
- Dayton, William L.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 271; in canvass of 1860, 294.
- Dearborn, Henry A. S.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 231.
- Debs, Eugene V.**, candidate for President, 1900, **2**, 34; popular votes for, 75; in 1904, 103; popular votes for, 137; in 1908, 168; popular votes for, 208; in 1912, 283; popular votes for 302.
- Debt, public**. See *Public Debt*.
- Defence, national**, in platforms, **2**, 342, 348, 353.
- Delaware**, appointment of electors by, in 1824, **1**, 134; adopts popular vote, 164.
- Delome, Señor**, Spanish ambassador at Washington, **2**, 14.
- Democratic party** (successor of Republican), convention of 1832, **1**, 160; of 1835, 181; of 1840, 199; condition of, in 1843, 269; convention of 1844, 211; of 1848, 232; divisions in the party, 233; convention of 1852, 248; of 1856, 264; of 1860, 282; seceders' convention, 285, 286; convention of 1864, 304; of 1868, 321; of 1872, 349; "Straight" Democrats, 349; convention of 1876, 374; of 1880, 411; of 1884, 433; of 1888, 468; of 1892, 498; divided by the silver question, 526; convention of 1896, 541; of 1900, **2**, 56; of 1904, 117; of 1908, 162; of 1912, 255; of 1916, 350.
- Dickerson, Mahlon**, proposes an amendment of the Constitution, **1**, 122.
- Dingley tariff**. See *Tariff*.
- Direct vote for President**. See *President*.
- Disqualified electors**. See *Electors*.
- District system** of choosing electors, **1**, 23, 38, 83, 93, 103, 148, 516.
- Disunion**, considered or threatened, **1**, 76, 146, 295, 298.
- Divorce laws**, uniform, in party platforms, **2**, 111, 197, 284, 371.
- Donelson, Andrew J.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 264, 273.
- Donnelly, Ignatius**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 42.
- "Doughfaces,"** origin of the word, **1**, 116.

- Douglas, Stephen A.**, 1, 247, 258; in the canvass of 1856, 264; leader of a Democratic faction, 280; debate with Lincoln, 281; in convention of 1860, 284; nominated for President, 286; popular and electoral votes for, 247; supports the Union cause, 298.
- Dow, Neal**, nominated for President, 1, 411; popular votes for, 417.
- Dred Scott decision**, 1, 279.
- Earl, Thomas**, Abolitionist candidate for President, 1, 202.
- Eaton, Mrs. General**, 1, 151, 160.
- Eaton, William W.**, proposes an amendment of the Constitution, 1, 396.
- Edmunds, George F.**, 1, 329, 387, 398, 402, 407, 408, 427, 432.
- Eight-hour day for labor**. See *Labor*.
- Elections, national interference in**, 1, 304, 401, 413, 498.
- Electoral commission**, text of the law creating it, 1, 382; its membership, 387, 392; action of, 388.
- Electoral system**, first proposed, 1, 4; adopted, 9; the law of 1793, 36; the system changed, 11, 12, 80; propositions to amend or abolish, 122, 358, 394, 395, 396, 397.
- Electoral votes**, election of 1789, 1, 27; of 1792, 39; of 1796, 51; of 1800, 63; of 1804, 84; of 1808, 95; of 1812, 104; of 1816, 112; of 1820, 121; of 1824, 140; of 1828, 149; of 1832, 164; of 1836, 188; of 1840, 204; of 1844, 223; of 1848, 243; of 1852, 257; of 1856, 276; of 1860, 297; of 1864, 307; of 1868, 328; of 1872, 353; of 1876, 392; of 1880, 417; of 1884, 448; of 1888, 483; of 1892, 517; of 1896, 568; of 1900, 2, 75; of 1904, 137; of 1908, 208; of 1912, 302.
count of, in 1789, 1, 29; in 1793, 40; in 1797, 51; in 1801, 67; in 1805, 84; in 1809, 95; in 1817, 112, 113; in 1821, 120; in 1825, 139; in 1837, 184; in 1857, 275; in 1861, 296; in 1865, 309; in 1869, 329; in 1873, 354; in 1877, 382, 399; in 1881, 418; in 1889, 484; in 1893, 518; in 1897, 560; in 1901, 2, 76; in 1905, 140; in 1909, 212; in 1913, 304.
rejection of, discussed and exercised, 1, 64-67, 114, 123, 275, 309, 354, 388; twenty-second joint rule, 309; text of, 310; pronounced unconstitutional, 359; rescinded by the Senate, 382; law of 1887, 453.
time of casting, 1, 36, 453; manner of voting, 9, 80; returns of, 9, 36, 80, 453; determination of contests, 64, 398, 453.
- Electors**, manner of appointing: in 1789, 1, 21; in 1792, 38; in 1796, 47; in 1800, 59; in 1804, 83; in 1808, 93; in 1812, 103; in 1824, 133; in 1832, 164; in 1868, 327; in 1872, 351; in 1876, 380; in 1880, 418; in 1892, 516, 518.
time of appointment, first election, 1, 20; law of 1792, 36; law of 1845, 242; Wisconsin electors, in 1856, 275; Georgia electors, in 1880, 418; law of 1887, 453.
official returns of appointment, 1, 9, 36, 80, 453.
determination of contests by grand committee proposed, 1, 64; the Edmunds proposition, 1879, 398; law of 1887, 453.
ineligible persons appointed, 1, 185.
See also *Electoral votes*, *rejection of*.
- Ellis, Seth H.**, candidate for President, 2, 37.
- Ellmaker, Amos**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 157.
- Ellsworth, Oliver**, votes for, for President, in 1796, 1, 51.
- Emancipation**, 1, 299, 302.
- Embargo**, 1, 89, 97.
- Employers' Liability**, in party platforms, 2, 160, 174, 192, 198, 202, 250, 267.
- England**. See *Great Britain*.
- English, William H.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 415.
- Equal Rights party**, New York faction, 1, 228.
- "Era of Good Feelings,"** 1, 115, 117.
- Evans, Samuel**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 463.
- Everett, Edward**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 290.
- Expunging resolution**, 1, 179.
- Fairbanks, Charles W.**, 2, 104, 155; nominated for Vice-President, 109; elected, 137; votes for, as candidate for President, convention of 1908, 181; nominated for Vice-President, 1916, 340.

- Farmers' Alliance**, 1, 491; platform, in 1900, 2, 33.
- "Federal thirteen,"** 1, 61.
- Federalist party**, the, at first election, 1, 24; supports Burr against Jefferson, 69; its attitude during Jefferson's administration, 76; coquets with the Clinton faction, 92; supports Pinckney and King, in 1808, 93; its course in the election of 1812, 101; destroyed by the success of its own principles, 106; last appearance in national politics, 112; attacked by John Quincy Adams, 146.
- Field, James G.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 513.
- Field, Stephen J.**, votes for, as candidate for President, in convention of 1880, 1, 415.
- Fifteenth amendment** to the constitution, enforcement of, 1, 49, 108, 175.
- Fillmore, Millard**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 238; elected, 243; becomes President, 246; in canvass of 1852, 247; nominated in 1856 by Americans, 264; by Whigs, 273; popular and electoral votes for, 276.
- Finley, Ebenezer B.**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, 1, 396.
- First election**, ordered by Congress, 1, 20.
- First national convention**, in 1812, 1, 101.
- Fisk, Clinton B.**, nominated for President, 1, 468; popular votes for, 483.
- Fitzpatrick, Benjamin**, nominated for Vice-President and declined, 1, 286.
- Five-twenty bonds.** See *Bonds*.
- Florida**, admitted to the Union, 1, 242; electors of, appointed by the legislature, in 1868, 327; vote in 1876 disputed, 381, 388.
- Floyd, John**, on vote of Missouri, in 1821, 1, 120; votes for, as President, in 1832, 164.
- Foote, Charles E.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 232.
- Foraker, Joseph B.**, votes for, as candidate for President in 1908, 2, 181.
- "Force Bill,"** 1, 490, 495, 498.
- Forest reserves**, in platforms, 2, 151, 176, 195, 204, 294.
- Foss, Eugene N.**, 2, 234, 255, 259.
- Fourth of March**, beginning of presidential term, 1, 29, 38.
- France**, relations with, as affecting politics, 1, 33, 41, 46.
- Franklin, Benjamin**, suggested for President, 1, 26.
- "Fraud of 1876,"** in politics and platforms, 1, 413, 416, 435.
- "Free ballot and fair count,"** in politics and platforms, 1, 413, 432, 437, 473, 495, 498, 512, 536, 554.
- Free homesteads.** See *Land, public*.
- Free-masonry**, a political issue, 1, 144, 155.
- Free ships and navigation laws.** See *Navigation laws*.
- Free silver**, in politics and platforms. See *Silver*.
- Free-soil party**, convention of 1848, 1, 238; of 1852, 253.
- Free trade**, in politics and platforms. See *Tariff*.
- Freemen's Bureau**, 1, 315, 323.
- Frelinghuysen, Theodore**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 223.
- Fremont, John C.**, nominated for President, 1, 264, 270; popular and electoral votes for, 276; nominated in 1864, but withdraws, 301.
- French Revolution**, its influence on American politics, 1, 33, 41, 46.
- Freneau, Philip**, 1, 34.
- Fugitive-slave law**, 1, 245, 249, 252, 254, 284, 287.
- Fuller, Melville W.**, Chief Justice, 2, 76, 140, 213.
- Funding system**, Hamilton's, 1, 42.
- Fusion**, in 1860, 1, 296; in 1880, 417; in 1892, 515; in 1896, 564.
- Gallatin, Albert**, nominated by caucus for Vice-President, 1, 131; withdraws, 132.
- Garfield, James A.**, 1, 387, 402, 407; nominated for President, 408; assaults upon, 415; elected, 417; assassination of, 419.
- Genêt, "Citizen,"** French minister, interferes in American politics, 1, 42.
- Georgia**, vote of, in 1868, 1, 327, 329, 331; votes, in 1872, for Greeley rejected, 354; its vote in 1880, 418.
- Gerry, Elbridge**, proposes choice of electors by State governors, 1, 4; plan

- of apportioning electors, 5; votes for John Adams, 48; nominated for Vice-President, 99; adds a word to the English language, 104; elected, 104.
- Gillhaus, August**, nominated for President, 2, 182; popular votes for, 208; nominated for Vice-President, 276.
- Gold standard**, established by Act of 1900, 2, 29; endorsed by Republicans, 47; condemned by Democrats, 62; by Silver Republicans, 65; other references, 72, 105, 119, 125, 249. See also *Silver*.
- Gorman, Arthur P.**, 1, 505.
- Graham, William A.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 251; in canvass of 1860, 289.
- Granger, Francis**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 183.
- Grant, Ulysses S.**, 1, 303, 315, 316; nominated for President, 320; elected, 328; condemned by Liberal Republicans, 341; nominated for reelection, 348; reflected, 352; on third term, 360; vetoes the "inflation" bill, 366; movement in his favor in 1880, 402, 407, 408.
- Graves, John T.**, nominated for Vice-President, 2, 206.
- Gray, George**, 2, 125, 155, 182, 186, 196.
- Gray, Isaac P.**, 1, 505.
- Great Britain**, relations with, as affecting politics, 1, 43, 87, 97, 482; 2, 79.
- Greeley, Horace**, on Know-Nothing party, 1, 260; opposes Mr. Seward, 290; opposes General Grant, 334; in canvass of 1872, 340; nominated for President, 344, 349; dies before the election, 351; popular votes for, 352; electoral votes for, 353; such votes objected to and rejected, 354.
- Greenback party**, convention of 1876, 1, 367; of 1880, 409; of 1884, 423.
- Greenbacks**, payment of bonds with, 1, 316, 322; volume of issue of, 365, 409, 429.
- Greer, James R.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 480.
- Groesbeck, William S.**, electoral votes for in 1872, 1, 353.
- Habeas Corpus**, suspension of the writ, 1, 298, 300, 323.
- Hadley, Herbert S.**, 2, 254.
- Hague conference**, in party platform, 2, 50.
- Hale, Eugene**, 2, 12, 32, 225.
- Hale, John P.**, nominated for President, but withdraws, 1, 232; nominated in 1852, 253; popular votes for, 257.
- "Half-breed,"** a faction of the Republican party, 1, 419.
- Hamilton, Alexander**, on the electoral system, 1, 2; proposes choice of electors by the people, 4, 5; decides to support John Adams, in 1789, 25; his supposed intrigue against Adams, 25; antagonism with Jefferson, 32; his funding system, 42; not a candidate for President, 44; his course in the canvass of 1796, 49; his influence upon the members of Adams's cabinet, 54; opposes Federalist support of Burr, 70; opposes Federalist disunion intrigue, 76; proposes amendment of the Constitution, 78; his view of the powers of the Supreme Court, 2, 305; on the power of removal from office, 310; on the veto power, 320, 325.
- Hamlin, Hannibal**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 295; elected, 297; in the canvass of 1864, 303; presides over the count of 1865, 311; in the canvass of 1868, 321.
- Hancock, John**, suggested for Vice-President, 1, 24; votes for, in 1789, 27; protests against the law of 1792, 39.
- Hancock, Winfield S.**, 1, 321, 325, 363; nominated for President, 415; popular and electoral votes for, 417.
- Hanford, Benjamin**, nominated for Vice-President, 2, 103, 168.
- Hanly, J. Frank**, nominated for President, 2, 367.
- Hanna, Marcus A.**, considered as opposing candidate to Roosevelt, 2, 95.
- "Hard cider"** campaign, 1, 190.
- "Hards,"** Democratic faction in New York, 1, 264, 282.
- Harmon, Judson**, 2, 255, 259.
- Harper, Jesse**, 1, 427.
- Harper, Robert G.**, votes for as Vice-President, in 1816, 1, 112; in 1820, 121.
- Harriman, Job**, nominated for Vice-President, 2, 34.
- Harris, William A.**, 2, 126.

- Harrison, Benjamin**, nominated for President, **1**, 479; elected (popular and electoral votes), 483; his administration, 486, 492; nominated for re-election, 1892, 497; popular and electoral votes for, 517.
- Harrison, Caleb**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 339.
- Harrison, Robert H.**, votes for in 1789, **1**, 27.
- Harrison, William H.**, suggested for Vice-President, 1828, **1**, 145; nominated for President in 1836, 183; popular votes for, 185; electoral votes for, 188; Whig candidate in 1840, 195; takes the stump, 202; popular votes for, 203; elected, 204; his inauguration, 205; dies, 207.
- Hartford Convention**, **1**, 106.
- Hawaii**, treaty of annexation withdrawn by Mr. Cleveland, **1**, 519; the question of, in politics and platforms, 525, 546, 553; annexed, **2**, 21; policy respecting, 68, 70.
- Hay-Pauncefote treaty**, **2**, 62, 179.
- Hayes, Rutherford B.**, **1**, 363, 368; nominated for President, 373; popular votes for, 383; declared elected, 393; his administration, 400.
- Hearst, William R.**, **2**, 96, 123, 154, 157, 199.
- Hendricks, Thomas A.**, **1**, 325, 330; votes for, as President, in 1872, 353; nominated for Vice-President, 379; in canvass of 1880, 412, 415; again nominated, 441; elected, 448; death in office, 472.
- Henry, John**, votes for, in 1796, **1**, 51.
- High cost of living**, in platforms, **2**, 225, 249, 261, 291, 343, 348, 366.
- Hill, David B.**, **1**, 492, 493, 505, 542, 548, 549; **2**, 57, 64.
- Hisgen, Thomas**, nominated for President, **2**, 206.
- Hoar, George F.**, **2**, 32.
- Hobart, Garret A.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 538; elected, 567, 568.
- Homesteads, free**, in politics and platforms. See *Land, public*.
- Hours of labor**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 370, 410, 422, 425, 462, 464, 512, 513, 540; **2**, 36, 115, 160, 167, 174, 192, 202, 264, 291; considered by Congress, **2**, 149, 180.
- House of Representatives**, election of President by, **1**, 9, 11, 71, 140; general debate and modern system of procedure in, **2**, 4.
- Houston, Samuel**, **1**, 248, 288.
- Howard, John E.**, suggested for President, **1**, 111; votes for as Vice-President, in 1816, 112.
- Howe, Archibald M.**, nominated for Vice-President, declines, **2**, 72.
- Hughes, Charles E.**, **2**, 155, 181, 227, 253; appointed a justice of the Supreme Court, 229; his theory of the power of the Executive, 331; nominated for President, 340.
- "Hunkers,"** Democratic faction, **1**, 229.
- Huntington, Samuel**, votes for, in 1789, **1**, 27.
- Hurst, Elmore W.**, **2**, 271.
- Idaho**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 518.
- Illinois**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 118.
- Immigration**, restriction of, in politics and platforms, **1**, 303, 320, 371, 401, 405, 410, 414, 419, 430, 438, 444, 462, 467, 474, 481, 496, 502, 506, 512, 531, 536, 544; **2**, 48, 68, 160, 195, 204, 223, 252, 370; Chinese, in particular, **1**, 336, 469; Japanese, **2**, 147.
- Impressment of American seamen**, **1**, 87, 88.
- Income tax**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 410, 422, 425, 431, 462, 511, 514, 540, 544, 552; **2**, 33, 40, 43, 65, 167, 191, 197, 262, 281, 285.
- Independence League**, **2**, 154, 157.
- Independence party**, convention of 1908, **2**, 199.
- Independent Treasury**, **1**, 192, 207, 227.
- Indiana**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 112; disputed votes of in 1817, 113.
- Informalities**, in certificates of electors, **1**, 85; of Massachusetts electors, 1808, 94; suspected, in 1824, 137.
- Ingersoll, Jared**, Federalist candidate for Vice-President, **1**, 102; votes for, in 1812, 104.
- "Initiative," in legislation**, **1**, 513; **2**, 34, 36, 43, 66, 111, 116, 132, 160, 168, 200, 282, 285, 289; 364.
- "Injunction, government by,"** **1**, 545, 554; **2**, 62, 116, 160, 168, 175, 180, 192, 201, 264, 267, 282, 290, 365.

- Insurance**, against sickness, etc., in platforms, **2**, 36, 157.
- Insurgents and insurgency**, **2**, 152, 218.
- Internal improvements**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 115, 143, 154, 158, 200, 241, 252, 255, 273, 294.
- Interstate commerce**. See *Railroads, regulation of*.
- Intervention**, between Spain and the United States, proposed, **2**, 16.
- Intoxicating liquor**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 339, 364, 426, 441, 443, 466, 505, 529, 530; **2**, 52, 110, 197, 284, 367.
- Iowa** admitted to the Union, **1**, 242.
- Iredell, James**, votes for, in 1796, **1**, 51.
- Irregularities**. See *Informalities*.
- Irrigation** of arid lands, in platforms, **2**, 49, 63, 67, 106, 121, 194, 205, 251, 285.
- Jackson, Andrew**, candidate for President, in 1824, **1**, 126; popular votes for, 136; electoral votes for, 136; votes for, in House of Representatives, 141; becomes a candidate in 1828, 144; popular votes for, 148; elected, 149; inaugurated, 150; his war on the United States Bank, 153, 162; forces the nomination of Van Buren, 160; re-elected, 164; his popularity, 179; his open opposition to Hugh L. White, 181; at Van Buren's inauguration, 189; his use of the power of removal from office, **2**, 312; his use of the veto power, 321.
- Jacobins**, opprobrious name of Democrats, **1**, 74.
- James, Ollie M.**, **2**, 257, 258.
- Japan**, relations with, **2**, 148.
- Japanese immigration**, in platforms, **2**, 42, 63; agitation in San Francisco, 147.
- Jay, John**, votes for, in 1789, **1**, 27; British treaty, 43; votes for, in 1790, 51; in 1800, 63.
- Jefferson, Thomas**, antagonism with Hamilton, **1**, 32; votes for, in 1792, 39; leader of the Republican party, 44; attacked by "Phocion," 45, 49; elected Vice-President, 51; votes for, in 1800, 63; elected by the House of Representatives, 72; his inauguration, 73; his course in office, 74, 77; nominated by the caucus for reelection, 82; reelected, 84; rejects Monroe's treaty, 88; induces Monroe to withdraw, 92; advocates acquisition of Cuba, **2**, 9.
- Jenkins, Charles J.**, votes for, as President, in 1872, **1**, 353.
- Johnson, Andrew**, **1**, 284; nominated for Vice-President, 303; elected, 307; becomes President, 313; features of his administration, 313; contest with Congress and impeachment, 315; denounced by Republican convention, 319; in the canvass of 1868, 321; praised by Democrats, 325; his use of the power of removal from office, **2**, 313; his use of the veto power, 324.
- Johnson, Hale**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 530.
- Johnson, Herschel V.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 286.
- Johnson, Hiram W.**, **2**, 285; nominated for Vice-President, 298.
- Johnson, John A.**, **2**, 154, 186, 196.
- Johnson, Richard M.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 182; electoral votes for, 188; elected by the Senate, 187; opposition to, in 1840, 198; not nominated for reelection, 201; electoral votes for, in 1840, 204; candidate for President, in 1844, 208; votes for in the convention, 212.
- Johnston, William F.**, nominated for Vice-President, in 1856, by the American party, **1**, 264; not adopted by the Republicans, 271.
- Joint Rule**, the twenty-second. See *Electoral system*.
- Jullan, George W.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 253; in canvass of 1872, 338, 344; electoral votes for, 352.
- Kansas**, the contest over, **1**, 258, 260, 268, 272, 279, 292.
- Kent, Chancellor**, on removals from office, **2**, 310.
- Kentucky** admitted to the Union, **1**, 38; its legislature nominates Clay, 126; contest in 1896 between Gold and Silver factions, 526; electoral vote divided, 567.
- Kern, John W.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 197; in the canvass of 1912, 256, 258.
- King, Leicester**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 232.

- King, Rufus, 1, 34;** Federalist candidate for Vice-President in 1804, 84; in 1808, 95; opposes coalition with Clintonians, in 1812, 101; votes for, for President, in 1816, 112.
- King, William R., 1, 199, 234;** nominated for Vice-President, in 1848, 249; elected, 257.
- Kirkpatrick, George R.,** nominated for Vice-President, 2, 360.
- "Kitchen Cabinet,"** the, 1, 152, 154, 159.
- "Know-Nothing"** order and party, 1, 259; convention of 1856, 261.
- Knox, General Henry,** suggested for Vice-President, 1, 24.
- Knox, Phllander C., 2, 156, 180.**
- Kremer, George,** charge by, against Henry Clay, 1, 138.
- Ku-Klux-Klan,** the, 1, 333.
- Kyle, James H., 1, 513.**
- Labor questions,** in politics and platforms, 1, 325, 337, 347, 350, 409, 414, 422, 426, 430, 437, 441, 462, 503, 512, 531, 540; 2, 35, 44, 62, 102, 113, 116, 160, 167, 174, 192, 201, 246, 267, 272, 281, 285, 291, 345, 360, 366, 371.
- Labor Reformers,** party of, convention of 1872, 1, 335.
- La Follette, Robert E., 2, 156, 181, 234, 235, 236, 253.**
- Land, public,** questions relating to, in politics and platforms, 1, 154, 179, 215, 221, 236, 255, 293, 324, 336, 344, 347, 350, 371, 377, 410, 423, 425, 430, 437, 438, 444, 461, 463, 469, 474, 500, 506, 512, 514, 531, 536, 540, 553; 2, 159, 222, 268, 294.
- Landrith, Ira D.,** nominated for Vice-President, 2, 367.
- Lane, Joseph, 1, 248, 284;** nominated for Vice-President, 285, 287; popular and electoral votes for, 297.
- Langdon, John,** presides over the first count, 1, 29; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1808, 95; nominated for Vice-President, in 1812, but declines, 99.
- Laurier, Sir Wilfrid,** Canadian statesman, 2, 371.
- Lecompton Constitution,** for Kansas, 1, 279, 292.
- Lee, Fitzhugh, 2, 15, 17.**
- Legal-tender notes.** See *Greenbacks*.
- Legislatures, State,** as nominating bodies for the presidency, 1, 168.
- Leonard, Jonah F. R., 2, 37.**
- Levering, Joshua, 1, 508** nominated for President, 530; popular votes for, 567.
- Lewis, James H., 2, 258.**
- Liberal Republicans,** origin of the party, 1, 335; convention in 1872, 240.
- Liberty League,** convention of 1848, 1, 232.
- Liberty party.** See *Abolitionists*.
- "Lilly white"** Republicans, 1, 516.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 1, 271;** the debate with Douglas, 281; in the canvass of 1860, 290; nominated for President, 294; elected, 297; his administration, 299; nominated in 1864, 303; elected, 307; his reconstruction plan, 309, 313; assassinated, 313.
- Lincoln, Benjamin,** vote for in 1789, 1, 27.
- Liquor, Intoxicating,** as a political issue, 1, 339, 364, 411, 441, 442, 466, 505, 529; 2, 38, 52, 104, 110, 197, 284.
- "Little Magician,"** the (Van Buren), 1, 191.
- "Loco-focos,"** Democratic faction in New York, 1, 228.
- Log cabin and hard elder campaign,** 1, 190.
- Logan, John A., 1, 427;** nominated for Vice-President, 432; popular and electoral votes for, 448.
- Louisiana,** purchase of, 1, 75; admitted to the Union, 103; frauds in Plaquemines Parish, in 1844, 16, 224; vote of the State in 1864, rejected, 311; vote in 1868 objected to but admitted, 330; returning boards, 351, 381; vote in 1872 disputed and not counted, 354; vote of 1876 contested before the Electoral Commission, 381, 389.
- Lyon, James,** nominated for President and declined, 1, 350.
- Lynching,** in a party platform, 2, 127.
- Machen, Willis B.,** votes for, for Vice-President, in 1872, 1, 353.
- McClellan, George B., 1, 299;** nominated for President, 305; his construction of the Democratic platform, 306; popular and electoral votes for, 307.
- McCombs, William F., 2, 271.**

McGovern, Francis E., 2, 242.

McKinley, William, the "McKinley Bill," 1, 489, 499, 524; votes for, as candidate for President, in 1892, 497; in the canvass of 1896, 527, 532; nominated for President, 538; his course during the canvass, 564; elected, 566; popular votes for, 567; electoral votes for, 568; urges revision of the tariff, 2, 2; his attitude on the Cuban rebellion, 13; efforts to maintain peace with Spain, 16; message which led to war, 17; nominated for reelection, 51; reelected, 75; his journeys, 83; advocates reciprocity, 84; assassinated, 85; tributes to his memory by the Republican convention of 1904, 108.

Maclay, William, 2, 308, 310.

McLean, John, considered as a candidate for President, in 1830, 1, 156; nominated for President, in 1836, 183; in the canvass of 1848, 230; votes for, in Whig convention, 237; in conventions of 1856, 264, 270; in the canvass of 1860, 289, 294.

Macon, Nathaniel, proposes amendment to the Constitution, 1, 122; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1824, 140.

Madison, James, 1, 6; nominated for President, in 1808, 91; elected, 95; his inauguration, 96; his administration, 97; yields to war party, 98; elected for a second term, 104; on the danger of legislative usurpation, 2, 306; on the veto power, 320; his use of the veto, 321.

"Magician, the little" (Van Buren), 1, 191.

Maguire, Matthew, nominated for Vice President, 1, 541.

Maine, admitted to the Union, 1, 118; liquor law, 339.

Maine, battleship, destruction of, 2, 14.

Maish, Levi, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, 1, 396.

Mangum, Willie P., votes for, for President, in 1836, 1, 188.

March 4th, beginning of presidential term, 1, 29, 38.

Marcy, William L., 1, 153, 247, 261; enunciates the theory of the "spoils" system, 2, 312.

Marshall, Humphrey, on the power to count electoral votes, 1, 277.

Marshall, John, his plan for deciding disputed electoral votes, 1, 66; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1816, 112; attends Anti-masonic convention, 156.

Marshall, Thomas R., 2, 255, 259; nominated for Vice-President, 271; elected, 302; nominated for reelection, 350.

Martin, David H., 2, 37.

Maryland, last State to abandon the district electoral system, 1, 164.

Mason, James M., on the electoral votes of Wisconsin, 1, 215.

Mason, John Y., 1, 261.

Massachusetts, plan of choosing electors, in 1789, 1, 23; in 1792, 38; by the legislature, in 1800, 60; defeat of Federalists, in 1804, 84; choice of electors in 1808, 93; in 1812, 103; in the Hartford Convention, 107.

Matchett, Charles H., nominated for Vice-President, in 1892, 1, 513; nominated for President, in 1896, 541; popular votes for, 567.

Maximum and Minimum rates of duty, 2, 173, 220, 229.

Meat inspection, 2, 149.

Merchant marine, encouragement of, in platforms, 2, 49, 63, 107, 122, 177, 192, 251, 268, 344, 349.

Merriam, Charles E., 2, 254.

Metcalf, Henry B., nominated for Vice-President, 2, 56.

Mexico, and Texas, 1, 226; war with, in politics and platforms, 227, 230, 234, 249; relations with, 341, 355, 369.

Michigan, admitted to the Union, 1, 184; votes of, how counted, in 1837, 187; an elector of, objected to in 1877, 390; electors chosen by districts, in 1892, 516.

"Middle-of-the-road" Populists, 1, 550.

Military interference, in elections. See *Elections*.

Mills, Roger Q., the "Mills Bill," 1, 459, 468, 471, 479, 482; resolution on Cuba, 2, 37.

Milton, John, votes for, in 1789, 1, 37.

Mines, public ownership of, 2, 36, 104, 167, 280, 366.

Minnesota, admitted to the Union, 1, 296.

Minority Presidents, 1, 17.

- Mississippi**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 118; votes of, in 1872, objected to, but counted, 354.
- Mississippi river**, improvement of, in platforms, **2**, 251, 266.
- Missouri**, question of admission to the Union, **1**, 116, 118; controversy over its vote in 1820, 118; its vote in 1872, 354.
- Missouri Compromise**, repeal of, **1**, 260, 271.
- Mitchell, John L.**, **1**, 505.
- Monopolies**. See *Trusts*.
- Monroe Doctrine**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 268, 300, 303, 476, 496, 520, 538, 546; **2**, 50, 60, 107, 109, 123, 264, 342, 355, 362, 369; application to the Spanish situation, 7; to the Venezuelan question, 91.
- Monroe, James**, diplomatic services abroad, **1**, 86, 88; candidate for President, in 1808, 89, 90; persuaded to withdraw, 93; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1808, 95; opposition to, in 1816, 108; nominated for President, 109; elected, 112; inauguration, 114; reelected, 118; second inauguration, 120.
- Montana**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 487.
- Morey letter**, **1**, 416.
- Morgan, John T.**, advocate of the Nicaragua Canal, **2**, 68.
- Morris, Gouverneur**, **1**, 3, 6, 12, 34, 58, 78, 83, 101, 111; his plan of a Council of State, **2**, 309; his opinion on the veto power, 320.
- Morris, Thomas**, Abolitionist candidate for Vice-President, **1**, 216.
- Morrison, William R.**, his tariff bill, **1**, 458; votes for, as candidate for President, 415, 505.
- Morse, Allen P.**, **1**, 505.
- Morton, Levi P.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 479; elected, 483; in the canvass of 1896, 527; votes for as candidate for President, 538.
- Morton, Oliver P.**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, **1**, 358; candidate for nomination as President, 361, 368, 373; member of the Electoral Commission, 387.
- "Mugwumps,"** or independent Republicans, **1**, 410, 432, 446, 457; denounced by Republican convention, 477.
- Munro, Donald R.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 182.
- Murchison, Charles F.** (fictitious name), letter to Lord Sackville, **1**, 482.
- Murphy, Franklin**, **2**, 181.
- "Narrow gauge" Prohibitionists**, **1**, 528.
- National Banks**. See *Banks*.
- National Democratic party** (of 1896), origin of, **1**, 550, 557; convention, 558.
- National Liberty party**, convention of 1904, **2**, 127.
- National party**. See *Greenback party*.
- National Republican party**, convention of, in 1831, **1**, 157; fusion with Anti-masons, 163; merged with the Whig party, 180.
- National Republican Progressive League**, **2**, 233.
- National Silver party**, convention of 1896, **1**, 555.
- Native American party**, **1**, 231; revival of, 259; convention in 1856, 261; condemned by Democratic convention, 266.
- Naturalization**, **2**, 149.
- Navigation laws** and free ships, in platforms, **1**, 414, 431, 439, 476, 496, 534, 559.
- Navy**, enlargement of, in platforms, **2**, 342, 348, 353, 363, 368.
- Nebraska**, act to admit to the Union, vetoed, **1**, 315; admitted, 327; an elector objected to, in 1877, 390.
- Nevada**, an elector objected to, in 1877, **1**, 390.
- New Hampshire**, choice of electors in 1789, **1**, 22.
- New Jersey**, its peculiar choice of electors in 1804, **1**, 94; extraordinary proceedings in, in 1812, 103; vote divided, in 1860, 297.
- New Mexico**, admitted to the Union, **2**, 223, 270.
- New York**, its great influence in politics, **1**, 15, 59, 229, 447, 449; party warfare and factions in, 23, 86, 100, 228, 419; loses its vote in 1789, 23; decided the election of 1800, 59; in the contest of 1824, 128, 129, 135; in the Democratic convention of 1848, 228, 232; its popular vote in 1868, 329; in 1884, 449. See also *Tammany Hall*.

- Nicaragua Canal.** See *Canal, Isthmian*.
- Nicholson, Samuel T.,** 2, 37.
- North Carolina,** peculiar appointment of electors in, in 1792, 1, 38; electors appointed by the legislature, in 1812, 103, 122.
- North Dakota,** admitted to the Union, 1, 487.
- Nullification,** 1, 154.
- Objections to electoral votes.** See *Electoral Votes, rejection of*.
- O'Connor, Charles,** 1, 305, 339; nominated for President, 350; popular votes for, 352.
- Official returns of elections,** discrepancies in, 1, 484, 516, 568.
- Ohio,** admitted to the Union, 1, 83.
- Oklahoma,** admission of, to the Union, advocated in platforms, 2, 49, 62, 67, 122; admitted, 143.
- Olney, Richard,** 2, 12, 124.
- Orders in Council,** British, 1, 88.
- Oregon,** the State of, admitted to the Union, 296; electoral vote of, in 1876, 381, 390.
- Oregon question,** the, 1, 215, 228.
- Osborne, John E.,** 2, 271.
- Ostend Manifesto,** 1, 261, 272; 2, 9.
- Over-capitalization of corporations,** in platforms, 2, 149.
- Pacific Railroad,** the, in platforms, 1, 273, 283, 287, 294, 303.
- Palmer, John M.,** 1, 321, 338, 340; electoral votes for, as Vice-President, in 1872, 353; nominated for President, 561; popular votes for, 567.
- Panama,** revolution in, and secession from Colombia, 2, 89, 109.
- Panama Canal.** See *Canal, Isthmian*.
- Panama mission,** opposed by Adams's political enemies, 1, 143.
- Pan-American conference,** in 1906, 2, 146, 177, 195, 355.
- Panic, financial,** of 1837, 1, 191; of 1873, 357.
- Parcel post,** advocated in platforms, 2, 251, 270, 297, 351.
- Parker, Alton B.,** 2, 96, 117; nominated for President, 123; his declaration on the gold standard, 125; in the canvass of 1904, 133; in the convention of 1908, 183; elected temporary chairman of the convention of 1912, 256.
- Parker, Joel,** 1, 325; nominated for Vice-President, 338; declines, 339; in the canvass of 1876, 379.
- Parker, John M.,** nominated for Vice-President, 2, 346.
- "Parting of the ways,"** 2, 232.
- Patent-law,** reform of, 2, 281, 293.
- Pauncefote, Sir Julian** (Lord), British ambassador at Washington, 2, 16.
- Payne-Aldrich tariff bill,** 2, 219, 229.
- Payne, Henry B.,** 1, 415.
- Pendleton, George H.,** nominated for Vice-President, 1, 305; popular and electoral votes for, 307; in the canvass of 1868, 316, 321, 325.
- Pennsylvania,** its influence in politics, 1, 15, 60, 86, 92, 93, 100, 275; appointment of electors in 1800, 60; its vote in 1876, 390.
- Pensions,** in politics and platforms, 1, 302, 320, 324, 347, 371, 405, 426, 430, 436, 462, 476, 502, 507, 512, 531, 535, 545, 554, 561; 2, 49, 66, 68, 72, 107, 111, 123, 177, 193, 297.
- People's party** (Populists), origin of, 1, 491; convention of 1892, 508; of 1896, 550; fusion, on electors, with Democrats, 564; fusionist wing, convention of 1900, 2, 39; Middle-of-the-road wing, convention of 1900, 42; of 1904, 114; of 1908, 158.
- Philippine Islands,** become American territory, 2, 23; insurrection in, 24; suppressed, in 1901, 77, 105; attitude of parties relative to the acquisition and retention of, 24, 31, 41, 50, 59, 68, 70, 120, 132, 149, 177, 195, 252, 342, 364, 370. See also *Anti-imperialism*.
- Pickens, Israel,** proposes an amendment to the constitution, 1, 122.
- Pickering, Timothy,** 1, 54.
- Pierce, Franklin,** nominated for President, 1, 248; elected, 257; his attitude on the slavery question, 260; in the Democratic convention of 1856, 264, 265; his theory of the veto power, 2, 323.
- Pinchot, Gifford,** 2, 220.
- Pinckney, Charles,** plan of, for an Executive, 1, 2.
- Pinckney, Charles C.,** votes for in 1796, 1, 51; minister to France, 56;

refuses to be a party to a treacherous coalition, 62; votes for in 1800, 63; candidate of Federalists for President, in 1804, 83; votes for, in 1804, 84; in 1808, 95.

Pinckney, Thomas, candidate for Vice-President, **1**, 44; votes for, in 1796, 51.

Pipe-lines as common carriers, **2**, 222.

Plaquemines Parish, frauds in, **1**, 16, 224.

Platforms, party:

Abolition, or Liberty party, in 1843, **1**, 216.

American, in 1888, **1**, 480.

Anti-imperialists, in 1900, **2**, 68.

Anti-imperialist League, in 1900, **2**, 69.

Anti-monopoly, in 1888, **1**, 422.

Barnburners, in 1848, **1**, 239.

Constitutional Union, in 1860, **1**, 289.

Continental party, in 1904, **2**, 129.

Democratic party, in 1840, **1**, 199; in 1844, 215; in 1848, 234; in 1852, 249; in 1856, 266; in 1860 (Douglas wing), 283; (Breckinridge wing), 287; in 1864, 304; in 1868, 322; in 1872, 349; ("Straight" Democrats), 349; in 1876, 374; in 1880, 413; in 1884, 434; in 1888, 468; in 1892, 498; in 1896, 542; in 1900, **2**, 58; in 1904, 119; in 1908, 186; in 1912, 260; in 1916, 350.

Farmers' Alliance, in 1900, **2**, 33.

Free Soil, in 1848, **1**, 239; in 1852, 253.

Greenback party, in 1876, **1**, 367; in 1880, 409; in 1884, 423.

Independence party, in 1908, **2**, 199.

"Know Nothing" party, in 1856, **1**, 261.

Labor Reformers, in 1872, **1**, 336.

Liberal Republicans, in 1872, **1**, 341.

National party, in 1896, **1**, 530.

National Democratic party, in 1896, **1**, 558.

National Liberty party, in 1904, **2**, 127.

National Silver party, in 1896, **1**, 555.

Native American party, in 1856, **1**, 261.

People's party (Populist), in 1892, **1**, 509; in 1896, 542; in 1900 (Fusion wing), **2**, 39; (Middle-of-the-road wing), in 1900, 43; in 1904, 115; in 1908, 159.

Progressive party, in 1912, **2**, 288; in 1916, 346.

Prohibition party, in 1872, **1**, 339; in 1876, 364; in 1880, 411; in 1884, 441; in 1888, 466; in 1892, 505; in 1896, 529; in 1900, **2**, 52; in 1904, 110; in 1908, 197; in 1912, 284; in 1916, 367.

Prohibition-Home-Protection party, in 1884, **1**, 442.

Radical Republican party, in 1864, **1**, 300.

Republican party, in 1856, **1**, 271; in 1860, 291; in 1864, 301; in 1868, 318; in 1872, 346; in 1876, 369; in 1880, 403; in 1884, 428; in 1888, 472; in 1892, 494; in 1896, 533; in 1900, **2**, 46; in 1904, 104; in 1908, 170; in 1912, 245; in 1916, 346.

Silver-Republican party, in 1900, **2**, 64.

Socialist party, in 1900, **2**, 34; in 1904, 98; in 1908, 162; in 1912, 277; in 1916, 360.

Socialist Labor party, in 1892, **1**, 513; in 1896, 539; in 1900, **2**, 44; in 1904, 97; in 1908, 182; in 1912, 272; in 1916, 339.

Union Labor party, in 1888, **1**, 461.

United Christian party, in 1900, **2**, 37; in 1904, 103.

United Labor, in 1888, **1**, 463.

United Reform party, in 1900, **1**, 37.

Whig party, in 1844, **1**, 220; in 1852, 251; in 1856, 273.

Young Men's National Republican party, in 1832, **1**, 158.

Platt amendment, regulating relations with Cuba, **2**, 81.

Pocket veto, **1**, 179, 317; **2**, 323, 324.

Polk, James K., vote for, as Vice-President, in 1840, **1**, 204; nominated for President, in 1844, 213; elected, 223; his administration, 227; jealous of Silas Wright, 229.

Polygamy, in platforms, **1**, 364, 371, 405, 419, 430, 442, 466, 475; **2**, 111, 122, 127, 184, 284.

Pomeroy, Samuel C., nominated for President, **1**, 442.

Popular sovereignty, **1**, 258, 280.

Popular votes for President: in 1824, **1**, 135; in 1828, 148; in 1832, 163; in 1836, 185; in 1840, 203; in 1844, 223;

- in 1848, 243; in 1852, 257; in 1856, 276; in 1860, 297 in 1864, 307; in 1868, 328; in 1872, 352; in 1876; 383; in 1880, 417; in 1884, 448; in 1888, 483; in 1892, 517; in 1896, 567; in 1900, 2, 78; in 1904, 137; in 1908, 208; in 1912, 302.
- Populists.** See *People's party*.
- Populists in the Senate**, their attitude on the tariff of 1897, 2, 7.
- Porto Rico**, policy respecting, 2, 24 (note), 26, 28, 47, 58, 62, 67, 68, 70, 105, 122, 149, 177, 195, 252.
- Postal Savings Banks**, advocated in platforms, 2, 33, 40, 116, 159, 173, 191, 197.
- Powers of the President**, prescribed in the Constitution, 2, 308; the power of appointment and removal, 309; the power to fill vacancies, 317; the veto power, 319; the power over legislation, 325.
- President of the United States**, method of election, 1, 2-9; 68, 71, 77-82; 121, 140, 358, 394; proposed election of, by direct popular vote, 1, 3, 13, 154, 300, 358, 365, 394, 396, 397, 431, 442, 531, 553; 2, 43, 282, 365; term of office, 1, 9, 153, 395; eligibility for reelection, 1, 1, 2(5), 153, 221, 300, 337, 343, 395, 513; 2, 263, 284, 371; third term, 1, 360, 402, 546; 2, 139, 235; resignation of, 1, 38; special elections, in case of vacancy, 1, 37, 395; succession to the office, 1, 37, 450; personal protection of, 2, 87.
- Presidential primaries**, 2, 239, 263, 289.
- Preston, James W.**, 2, 271.
- Preston, Martin B.**, nominated for President, 2, 182.
- Primary elections**, in platforms, 2, 132, 239, 263, 289.
- Proctor, Redfield**, his report on conditions in Cuba, 2, 15.
- Progressive party**, 2, 285; convention of 1912, 288; of 1916, 346.
- Prohibition party**, convention of 1872, 1, 339; of 1876, 364; of 1880, 411; of 1884, 441, 442; of 1888, 465; of 1892, 505; of 1896, 529; of 1900, 2, 51; of 1904, 109; of 1908, 197; of 1912, 284; of 1916, 367.
- Protection**, of American industry (see *Tariff*); of American citizens abroad, 2, 50, 108, 122, 176, 193, 205, 251, 270, 297, 340, 342, 346.
- Public debt**, in platforms, 1, 303, 316, 319, 322, 370, 409, 422, 462.
- Publicity**, of campaign contributions, in platforms, 2, 149, 180, 188, 201, 223, 250, 263.
- Public lands.** See *Land, public*.
- Pure Food Law**, 2, 149, 277.
- Radical Republicans**, convention of 1864, 1, 299.
- Railroads**, and grants to (see *Land, public*); regulation of, or public ownership, in platforms, 1, 337, 364, 410, 422, 425, 430, 461, 474, 506, 512, 513, 531, 540, 552; 2, 117, 159, 174, 189, 264, 280, 365; control by the government, 2, 33, 36, 40, 61, 67, 132, 190, 202, 254; Act of 1910, 222.
- Randall, Samuel J.**, 1, 415.
- Randolph, Edmund**, plan for an Executive, 1, 2.
- Randolph, John**, opposition to Jefferson, 1, 87; stickler for the privileges of the House, 95; on the count of the Missouri vote, in 1821, 119, 120.
- Readjusters**, of Virginia, 1, 417.
- Reannexation.** See *Texas*.
- Rebates**, by railroads, 2, 150, 174, 189, 203.
- Recall**, of public officers, 2, 36, 43, 116, 160, 200, 282, 289, 364.
- Recess**, constructive, of the Senate, 2, 318.
- Reciprocity**, in platforms, 1, 490, 495, 500, 534; 2, 48, 107, 123, 130; advocated by President McKinley, 83, 84; with Canada, 152, 229.
- Reconstruction**, after the Civil War, 1, 301, 308, 313, 318, 333.
- Red bandanna**, 1, 472.
- Reed, Thomas B.**, Speaker, and the rules of the House, 1, 487; votes for, as candidate for President, 1892, 497, in the canvass of 1896, 527; votes for; as candidate for President, 538; elected Speaker of the 55th Congress; 2, 4; opposed to the Philippine policy, 32; prevents passage of free silver bill, 224.
- Reed, Whitelaw**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 498; popular and electoral votes for, 517.

- Referendum**, in politics and platforms, 1, 513; 2, 34, 36, 43, 66, 116, 132, 160, 168, 200, 282, 285, 289, 364.
- Reimer, Arthur E.**, nominated for President in 1912, 2, 276; in 1916, 339.
- Rejection of electoral votes.** See *Electoral votes*.
- Removal of deposits**, from the Bank of the United States, 1, 178.
- Removals from office**, in platforms. See *Civil Service reform*, power of the President discussed, 2, 309.
- Republican party**, creation of the, 1, 260; convention of 1856, 269; of 1860, 290; of 1864, 301; of 1868, 318; of 1872, 345; of 1876, 368; of 1880, 402; of 1884, 427; of 1888, 472; of 1892, 494; of 1896, 532; of 1900, 2, 45; of 1904, 104; of 1908, 169; of 1912, 240; of 1916, 346.
- Republican party** (Jeffersonian, first known as Anti-Federalist), nominates Jefferson and Burr, in 1796, 1, 44; its victory in 1800, 63. See *Democratic party*.
- Resignation of President.** See *President*.
- Resumption of specie payments**, in platforms, 1, 333, 343, 366, 370, 372, 375, 376, 379, 401.
- Returns of electors.** See *Electoral system*.
- Rhode Island**, an elector of, objected to in 1877, 1, 391.
- Riddle, Haywood Y.**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, 1, 396.
- Rives, William C.**, 1, 182, 195 (note), 289.
- Rodney, Daniel**, votes for, as Vice-President, in 1820, 1, 121.
- Roosevelt, Theodore**, Governor of New York, 2, 45; nominated for Vice-President, 51; in the canvass of 1900, 73; elected, 74; succeeds President McKinley, 86; acts to end the coal strike, in 1902, 93; nominated for reelection, 109; elected, 137; not a candidate for a third term, 139, 140; characteristics of his second administration, 141; initiates movement to end the Russo-Japanese War, 147; the attempt to stampede the convention of 1908 in his favor, 178, 216; his earnestness in advocating the nomination of Taft, 216; return from Africa, 225; in the New York campaign of 1910, 227; his third-term theory, 235; becomes a candidate for the Republican nomination, 236; advises his supporters to withdraw from the convention, 245; votes for, in the Republican convention of 1912, 253; nominated by the Progressives, 298; popular and electoral votes for, 302; his theory of a "constructive recess" of the Senate, 317; his power over legislation, 328; nominated for President in 1916, and declined, 346.
- Root, Elihu**, 2, 104, 146, 155, 177, 242.
- Ross, James**, votes for, as Vice-President, in 1816, 1, 112.
- Rule of Reason**, 2, 233.
- "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion,"** 1, 447.
- Rural credits**, in platforms, 2, 265, 291, 344, 348, 356.
- Rush, Richard**, votes for, as Vice-President, in 1820, 1, 118, 121; nominated in 1828, 146; votes for, 149.
- Russell, John**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 340.
- Russo-Japanese War**, 2, 147.
- Rutledge, John**, votes for, in 1789, 1, 27.
- Sackville, Lord**, British ambassador, 1, 482.
- St. John, John P.**, nominated for President, 1, 446; popular votes for, 448.
- Samoa**, 2, 50.
- Sampson, Ezekiel S.**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, 1, 396.
- Sanford, Nathan**, proposes an amendment to the Constitution, 1, 122; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1824, 140.
- Santo Domingo**, proposed annexation of, 1, 333; relations with, 2, 145.
- "Scallawags,"** 1, 357.
- Schools, public**, in platforms, 1, 364, 371, 475, 502, 507, 514, 531, 540.
- Scott, Winfield**, votes for, in Whig convention, in 1848, 1, 237; in canvass of 1852, 247; nominated for President, 251; popular and electoral votes for, 257.

- Seal fishery**, 2, 223.
- Seceded States**, electoral votes of, rejected, 1, 309, 329.
- Secession**, 1, 298.
- Seidel Emil**, nominated for Vice-President, 2, 283.
- Senate**, abolition of the, advocated by Socialists, 1, 541; 2, 168, 282, 365.
- Senators**, United States, election of, by popular vote, 1, 513, 531, 553; 2, 34, 38, 43, 62, 65, 112, 180, 193, 197, 205, 262, 284, 298.
- Sergeant, John**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 157.
- Sewall, Arthur**, nominated for Vice-President, by the Democrats, 1, 549; votes for, in the Populist convention, 554; nominated by the National Silver party, 557; popular votes for, 567; electoral votes, 568.
- Seward, William H.**, his relations with Taylor and Fillmore, 1, 247; in the canvass, of 1856, 270; in the canvass of 1860, 290, 294.
- Seymour, Horatio**, 1, 304, 305, 321; nominated for President, 326; his political position, 327; popular and electoral votes for, 328; in the canvass of 1880, 412, 415.
- Sheldon, George L.**, 2, 181.
- Sherman, James S.**, nominated for Vice-President, 2, 181; elected, 208; in the New York canvass of 1910, 227; nominated for reelection, 254.
- Sherman, John**, 1, 402, 407, 408, 427, 432, 478, 479.
- Sherman Silver Purchase Act**, 1, 490, 501, 521; repealed, 522.
- Sherman Trust Act**. See *Trusts*.
- Ship-purchase Bill**, 2, 344, 352.
- Ship subsidies**, 2, 49, 63, 107, 122, 177, 251, 268, 344, 369.
- Silver question**, the, in politics and platforms, 1, 366, 368, 401, 409, 413, 430, 437, 462, 475, 490, 494, 495, 501, 506, 508, 511, 521, 526, 529, 531, 532, 535, 537, 541, 543, 547, 551, 555, 559.
- Silver Republicans**, their attitude on the tariff, in 1897, 2, 6; convention of 1900, 64.
- Single term**, for the President, 2, 263, 284.
- Slavery**, in politics and platforms, 1, 115, 200, 202, 216, 226, 236, 239, 249, 252, 254, 258, 262, 266, 271, 273, 279, 283, 287, 292, 299, 300, 302.
- Smith, Gerrit**, nominated for President, 1, 232.
- Smith, Green Clay**, nominated for President, 1, 364.
- Smith, William**, votes for, as Vice-President, in 1828, 1, 149; in 1836, 188.
- Socialist Labor party**, convention of 1892, 1, 513; of 1896, 538; of 1900, 2, 44; of 1904, 112; of 1908, 181; of 1912, 272; of 1916, 339.
- Socialist party**, convention of 1900, 2, 34; of 1904, 97; of 1908, 161; of 1912, 276; of 1916, 360.
- "Softs,"** Democratic faction, in New York, 1, 264, 282.
- Soldiers' vote**, in 1864, 1, 307.
- "Solid South,"** 1, 105, 406, 447.
- South Carolina**, appointment of electors by the legislature, 1, 148, 164; abandons the system, 327; vote of 1876 disputed, 381, 391.
- South Dakota**, admitted to the Union, 1, 487.
- Southgate, James H.**, nominated for Vice-President, 1, 532.
- Spain**, relations with, 1, 520, 536; war with in 1898, 2, 8, *et seq.*; war declared, 20; peace restored, 21.
- Speaker of the House**, power of the, 2, 187, 224.
- Special elections** of President. See *President*.
- Specie circular**, Jackson's, 1, 179.
- Specie payments**, resumption of. See *Resumption*.
- Spells system**. See *Civil Service reform*.
- Springer, William M.**, 1, 395.
- "Squatter sovereignty."** See *Popular sovereignty*.
- "Stalwarts,"** a faction of the Republican party, 1, 419.
- Stampede**, in political conventions, rules for the prevention of, 1, 174, 369, 468; for Roosevelt, attempted, 2, 170.
- Standard Oil Company**, 2, 151; dissolution of, 232, 262.
- "Stand-patters,"** 2, 152.
- Stanton, Edwin M.**, contest with President Johnson, 1, 315, 405, 430.
- Star-route frauds**, 1, 419.
- State rights**, in platforms, 1, 75, 106, 180.

- "Steam-roller,"** 2, 242.
- Stevenson, Adlai E.,** nominated for Vice-President, 1, 505; elected, 517; again a candidate in 1900, 2, 64; popular and electoral votes for, 75.
- Stewart, G. T.,** nominated for Vice-President, 1, 364.
- Stockton, Richard,** votes for, as Vice-President, in 1820, 1, 121.
- Story, Joseph,** on removals from office, 2, 310.
- Streeter, A. J.,** nominated for President, 1, 463; popular votes for, 483.
- Subsidies.** See *Ship subsidies*.
- Succession to the Presidency.** See *President*.
- Sulzer, William,** 2, 258, 271.
- Sumner, Charles,** 1, 270; opposes Grant, 334.
- Supreme Court,** decisions by, relative to the Philippines and Porto Rico, 2, 78; introduces the "rule of reason," 233; abolition of its power to pronounce acts unconstitutional, advocated, 282, 365.
- Swallow, Silas C.,** nominated for President, 2, 112.
- Taft, William H.,** 2, 156, 169; nominated for President, 180; elected, 208; inaugurated, 212; photographed with Roosevelt, 214; difficulties of his administration, 232; nominated for reelection, 253; popular and electoral votes for, 302.
- Tammany Hall,** its influence in national politics, 1, 228, 363, 412, 433, 446, 515; 2, 260.
- Tariff,** the, in politics and platforms, 1, 108, 115, 143, 154, 158, 200, 220, 227, 252, 268, 293, 336, 343, 347, 350, 371, 376, 405, 416, 419, 423, 426, 429, 436, 442, 444, 458, 466, 467, 473, 480, 489, 494, 499, 504, 506, 508, 523, 531, 533, 544, 558; 2, 2, 6, 7, 41, 46, 61, 66, 69, 72, 105, 107, 111, 162, 172, 180, 189, 203, 218, 248, 260, 281, 285, 296, 343, 349, 350, 351.
- Tariff Commission,** of 1882, 1, 419; of 1909, 2, 220, 249; a, advocated, in platforms, 343, 349, 351.
- Taylor, George E.,** nominated for President, 2, 127.
- Taylor, Zachary,** movement in his favor, 1, 230; recommended by Native-Americans, 231; nominated for President, by Whig party, 237; elected, 243; his conduct in office, 244; dies in office, 246.
- Tazewell, Littleton W.,** Democratic candidate (not nominated) for Vice-President, in 1840, 1, 199; electoral votes for, 204.
- Telegraphs and telephones,** control of, by government, in platforms, 1, 506, 512, 531, 540, 553; 2, 33, 36, 43, 117, 159, 167, 280, 365.
- Telfair, Edward,** votes for, in 1789, 1, 27.
- "Teller" amendment,** to the resolution declaring war with Spain, 2, 19.
- Teller, Henry M.,** 1, 537, 538; votes for, as candidate for President, 549.
- Tennessee,** admitted to the Union, 1, 47; its legislature nominates Jackson, 144; its vote not counted in 1864, 311.
- Tenure of Office Act,** 1, 315, 457; 2, 313.
- Texas,** annexation of, 1, 209, 215, 226, 227; admitted to the Union, 242; vote of, in 1872, objected to, 354.
- Thompson, A. M.,** nominated for Vice-President, 1, 411.
- Thurman, Allen G.,** 1, 379, 387, 415, 423, 440; his red bandanna, 473; nominated for Vice-President, 472; popular and electoral votes for, 354.
- Tibbles, Thomas H.,** nominated for Vice-President, 2, 117.
- Tilden, Samuel J.,** 1, 363, 374; nominated for President, 379; popular votes for, 383; electoral votes for, 392; in the canvass of 1880, 411, 415; in the canvass of 1884, 439.
- Tippecanoe,** the hero of, 1, 196.
- Tobacco "trust,"** dissolution of the, 2, 252, 262.
- Tompkins, Daniel D.,** proposed for President, 1, 109; nominated for Vice-President, 110; elected, 112; reflected, 121.
- Towne, Charles A.,** refuses Populist nomination as candidate for Vice-President, 2, 39; votes for, in Democratic convention, 1900, 196.
- Treasury circular,** Jackson's, 1, 179.
- Treaty of Paris,** restoring peace with Spain, 2, 26; ratified, 28.

- Trusts**, in politics and platforms, **1**, 463, 466, 474, 496, 500 507, 545; **2**, 33, 35, 43, 48, 60, 66, 104, 106, 111, 115, 120, 149, 151, 169, 173, 180, 203, 248, 261, 292; tariff on articles controlled by, **2**, 6, 41, 61, 66, 189.
- Tweed ring**, **1**, 329, 363.
- Twenty-second joint rule**. See *Electoral votes*.
- Two-thirds rule**, in Democratic conventions, **1**, 161, 175, 182, 212, 233, 284, 286, 288, 433.
- Tyler, John**, favors a caucus nomination, in 1824, **1**, 128; nominated for Vice-President, 1836, 183; electoral votes for, 188; nominated by Whigs, 1840, 195; elected, 204; becomes President, 207; his breach with the Whigs, 207; nominated for reelection and withdraws, 221.
- Underwood, Oscar W.**, **2**, 255, 259.
- Union Labor party**, convention of 1888, **1**, 460.
- Union Reform party**, convention of 1900, **2**, 36.
- Unit rule**, in conventions, **1**, 173, 374, 403, 433; **2**, 244, 256.
- United Americans**, order of, **1**, 259.
- United Christian party**, convention of 1900, **2**, 37; of 1904, 103.
- United Labor party**, convention of 1888, **1**, 463.
- Utah**, Territory of, **1**, 246; fusion in the State of, and its divided vote, 563, 567, 568.
- Vacancies in office**, during the recess of the Senate, **2**, 317.
- Van Buren, Martin**, his first appearance in politics, **1**, 100; in the caucus of 1824, 131; votes for, as Vice-President, in 1824, 140; political mission to the South, 144; rejected as minister to England, 155; nominated for Vice-President, 161; elected, 164; nominated for President, 182; popular votes for, 185; electoral votes for, 188; his administration, 188; estimate of his character, 190; his opposition to banks, 192; nominated for reelection, 201; popular votes for, 203; electoral votes, 204; the Democratic favorite for 1844, 206; his letter on Texas, 210; defeated for nomination by the two-thirds rule, 212; 213; praised by the Democratic convention, 216; nominated by the "Barnburners," 1848, 238; by the Free-soilers, 239; popular votes for, 243.
- Venezuela**, President Cleveland's action, **1**, 520; other references, **2**, 82, 144.
- Vermont**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 38; disputed validity of its votes, 52; its electoral vote in 1876, 391.
- Veto**, "pocket," **1**, 179; **2**, 322, 324; President Johnson's vetoes, **1**, 315; **2**, 324; President Cleveland's, **1**, 458; **2**, 324; power of the President discussed, 319; abolition of the power advocated in platforms, **1**, 541; **2**, 282.
- Vice-President**, the office of, suggested, **1**, 7; abolition of the office proposed, 79; method of electing, changed, 80; Richard M. Johnson elected by the Senate, 187.
- Virginia**, adopts general ticket system in 1800, **1**, 60; the "Virginia dynasty," 89, 106.
- Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions**, of 1788 and 1789, **1**, 57, 249, 267.
- Voorhees, Daniel W.**, **1**, 305, 522.
- Wage system**, denounced by Socialist parties, **2**, 35, 100, 103, 113, 163, 272, 277, 339.
- Wakefield, W. H. T.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 465.
- War Democrats**, **1**, 298, 306, 356.
- War of 1812**, **1**, 98, 108.
- Washington, Booker T.**, his luncheon with President Roosevelt, **2**, 86.
- Washington, George**, universal choice for first President, **1**, 24, acquiesces in the selection of Adams for Vice-President, 25; electoral votes, 1789, 27; his inauguration, 30; reelected in 1792, 39; second inauguration, 41; declines a third term, 44; his farewell address, 45; votes for, in 1796, 51; attempt to elect him in 1800, 58; his sparing use of the veto, **2**, 321.
- Washington, State of**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 487.
- Watkins, Aaron S.**, nominated for Vice-President, in 1908, **2**, 198; in 1912, 285.

- Watson, Thomas E.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 554; his position in the canvass of 1896, 562, 564; popular votes for, 567; electoral votes for, 568; nominated for President, in 1904, **2**, 117; in 1908, 161.
- Watterson, Henry**, **1**, 505.
- Weaver, James B.**, nominated for President, 1880, **1**, 411; popular votes for, 417; again nominated, 1892, 513; popular and electoral votes for, 517.
- Webster, Daniel**, elector for Monroe, in 1820, **1**, 118; nominated by legislature for President, 1836, 183; popular votes for, 185; electoral votes, 188; in the canvass of 1848, 230; votes for in Whig convention, 237; the compromises of 1850, 245; in the canvass of 1852, 247; unsuccessful manœuvre to nominate him, 250; popular votes for, 257.
- West, A. M.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 427.
- West Virginia**, the State of, formed from Virginia, **1**, 308.
- Weyler, General**, Spanish Governor-General of Cuba, **2**, 13.
- Wheeler, William A.**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 373; elected, 393.
- Whig party**, origin of, **1**, 179; attitude of, on the bank question, 184, 192; convention of 1839, 193; disclaims responsibility for Tyler's acts, 207; convention of 1844, 220; of 1848, 237; of 1852, 250; moribund after the election of 1852, 258; convention of 1856, 273.
- Whiskey insurrection**, **1**, 42.
- Whiskey ring**, **1**, 357, 363.
- White, Edward D.**, Chief Justice, **2**, 229, 304.
- White, Hugh L.**, nominated for President, **1**, 183; popular votes for, 185; electoral votes, 188.
- "White slavery,"** **2**, 222.
- Wilkins, William**, nominated for Vice-President, **1**, 160; electoral votes for, 164.
- Williams, James B.**, **2**, 126.
- Williams, John S.**, **2**, 118, 125, 134.
- Williams, Samuel W.**, nominated for Vice-President, **2**, 161.
- Willmot proviso**, **1**, 230.
- Wilson-Gorman tariff**, **1**, 524; **2**, 2.
- Wilson, Henry**, **1**, 318, 321, 345; nominated for Vice-President, 348; elected, 352.
- Wilson, James**, proposes system of election by electors, **1**, 4.
- Wilson, Woodrow**, his canvass for Governor of New Jersey, **2**, 228; candidate for nomination as President, 255; nominated, 259; elected, 302; nominated for reelection, 350.
- Wing, Simon**, nominated for President, **1**, 513; popular votes for, 517.
- Wirt, William**, nominated for President, **1**, 156; electoral votes for, 164.
- Wisconsin**, admitted to the Union, **1**, 242; disputed electoral votes, in 1857, 275; in 1877, 391.
- Woman suffrage**, in platforms, **1**, 340, 348, 371, 426, 441, 445, 462, 466, 467, 506, 514, 530, 536; **2**, 36, 38, 167, 198, 281, 284, 289, 345, 364, 367.
- Wood, Fernando**, **1**, 282.
- Woodford, Stewart L.**, **2**, 12, 15.
- Wool, tariff on**, **1**, 429, 473, 524, 534.
- Woolley, John G.**, nominated for President, **2**, 56.
- Wright, Silas**, nominated for Vice-President, and declines, **1**, 213; war upon him, in New York, 229; dies, 230.
- Wyoming**, State of, admitted to the Union, **1**, 518.
- Yancey, William L.**, resolution offered by, **1**, 236.



HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.



99-5B1958

Bound To Please® N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 668 648 0